



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2016

No. 136

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, September 12, 2016, at 3 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2016

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of mercy, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

On this day, we ask Your blessing on the men and women of the people's House who have been entrusted with the care of this great Nation's people. Because of the great blessings you have bestowed on our Nation, may we embrace the opportunity to build a better world beyond our borders as well.

As another election approaches, Members are understandably focused on their campaigns. Give them the energy and courage to remain focused as well on the demands of office facing them now.

This is difficult, but our Nation and our world have many issues calling for attention, and these few have the privilege of addressing them with some hope of bringing resolution that may be of benefit to us all.

May all that they do this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. COSTA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CONGRATULATIONS TO TEAM USA

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate all of our Olympians and Paralympians who represented Team USA in Rio de Janeiro this year.

The United States brought in 121 medals at the Olympic Games last month, and with the start of the Paralympics this week, I am confident that Team USA's staggering medal count will rise even higher.

The Illinois 13th District sent some incredibly talented athletes to the Games this year. Nichole Millage; my friend Tatyana McFadden and her sister Hannah; Ryan Held, a gold medalist from Springfield, Illinois; Lauren

Doyle and Kelsey Card; as well as wheelchair basketball coach Stephanie Wheeler were selected to represent their country on Team USA; for many, the dream of a lifetime.

These individuals endured hours of rigorous training, overcame personal struggles, and sacrificed simple pleasures to represent our country on the global stage. They are the best and brightest our country has to offer, as well as some of the world's most skilled athletes. They have certainly made their hometowns proud, and it is an honor to represent them in Congress.

PROGRESO LATINO'S 39TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Progreso Latino, the State of Rhode Island's leading Latino human services organization that is celebrating its 39th anniversary this weekend.

For nearly four decades, Progreso Latino has empowered Rhode Island's Latino community, providing direct advocacy, adult education, child care, and youth programs that have helped build strong, sustainable neighborhoods across our State. They have done this work with great professionalism and a deep commitment to the community.

Progreso Latino has gone above and beyond to provide essential healthcare services for families, including

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5227

wellness programs, preventive care, and regular checkups.

Headquartered in the city of Central Falls, this organization continues to play a critical role today in meeting the needs of Rhode Island's Latino families and ensuring they have an opportunity to get ahead.

I am delighted to congratulate Progreso Latino and the dedicated men and women of this extraordinary organization as they celebrate 39 years of service this Saturday.

SUICIDE PREVENTION MONTH

(Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the death toll due to mental illness continues to climb. Yesterday we lost another 118 lives to suicide, and this brings the total lives lost since passage of H.R. 2646 to 7,670.

We lost another 959 lives to mental illness, bringing the total of lives lost to 62,355 since House passage of my bill in July. If nothing is done today, then tomorrow we will lose more. By Monday, another 2,800.

I hope my colleagues in the Senate are moved to action by this continued loss of lives, which is preventable. But if it's popularity, approval ratings, or upcoming elections that our friends are worried about, my friends should know that most Americans believe the country is losing ground in dealing with mental health. In fact, 83 percent of the country thinks so, according to a national mental health survey.

Mr. Speaker, how high does the death toll need to climb before the Senate decides to act? We only have a few legislative days left in September. We can either spend that time reading more obituaries or news clips of tragedies or passage of H.R. 2646. It is absolutely clear that America wants us to act now. The question is: Will the Senate finally act and bring treatment before tragedy?

CALIFORNIA'S WATER CRISIS

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention today to the ongoing water crisis facing California. The drought is not over, nor has Congress addressed the underlying reasons for the disproportional impact on the San Joaquin Valley communities and the conditions that we face.

It has been reported that California could be facing a La Niña condition this upcoming winter. That means that we will have dry conditions and further loss of available water for people, farms, and the environment.

We must pass legislation that will be signed into law which will create a rational, balanced water policy, both in

the short and long term, that benefits California's farm communities and the environment.

I will submit later for the RECORD a thoughtful op-ed piece written by a constituent and friend of mine, Cannon Michael. He is a farmer in the valley. We share a lot of the same frustration over how Congress has failed to pass legislation to solve California's water problems. This op-ed piece describes exactly how the people of the valley feel, and I urge my colleagues to come together to enact legislation that California desperately needs this year.

RECOGNIZING THE JEWISH COMMUNITY SERVICES OF SOUTH FLORIDA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of the Jewish Community Services of South Florida, an organization that is committed in lending a hand to those members of our society who need it the most.

Through its many programs, such as mental health counseling, homelessness prevention, and assistance to those with developmental disabilities, JCS is dedicated to bringing aid and smiles and providing the necessary care for those in need.

Since its founding in 1920, this organization has not strayed from its clear goals to improve the quality of life for families in our south Florida community.

The Jewish Community Services of South Florida will be delivering its 10,000th Rosh Hashanah holiday basket to homebound seniors, many living at or below the poverty level.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly honored to recognize this organization's mission, and to JCS I say mazel tov on a job well done.

THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF 9/11

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday marks the 15th anniversary of 9/11, a day when we suffered from the savagery of mankind at its worst and witnessed the courage of humanity at its best.

In our collective sorrow, I have never seen this body so united and determined to protect our people, to protect America. We found strength from one another. I am proud of the way my city, my country, and my colleagues responded.

I am grateful for the privilege of working with our first responders, survivors, and families, and my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to pass the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Reauthorization Act, so that anyone suffering from the wounds of 9/11 will never have to worry about the

health care and assistance they deserve.

It is in this way we remember and honor those who carry the wounds of that very dark day and who deserve the thanks of a grateful nation. It is in this way that we show we will never forget.

MESQUITE, NEVADA, A PURPLE HEART CITY

(Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, the Purple Heart is our Nation's oldest military decoration. It is a unifying symbol that binds together men and women who have bled for freedom.

When these brave warriors return to our communities, we cannot forget them and their sacrifice. That is why I am proud to recognize my hometown of Mesquite, Nevada, for its decision to become a Purple Heart City.

The decision, which will be formally announced next week, will signal to all veterans throughout southern Nevada and around the country that Mesquite welcomes them and is proud to honor their service. I would like to thank Chapter 711 of the Military Order of the Purple Heart for working with the city of Mesquite to make this day possible.

It is my hope that more communities take this step to honor the sacrifices of these heroes by becoming Purple Heart communities.

I can't wait to see that Purple Heart flag proudly flying over Mesquite.

HONORING MAJOR TRAVIS BRUNELLE

(Mr. JOLLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a man who spent his entire adult life serving our country, a man who served with great distinction, and a man who truly was an American patriot. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor U.S. Army Major Travis Brunelle of Tampa, Florida.

Major Brunelle enlisted in the Army in 1991. In 2002, he graduated from Florida State University with a bachelor's degree in information studies and was commissioned a 2nd lieutenant in the infantry, gaining his commission through ROTC at Florida State. He attended the Infantry Officer's Basic Course, where he served as a platoon leader and would go on to attend the Special Forces Officers Qualification Course. In October 2004, Brunelle earned the coveted Green Beret.

Then-Captain Brunelle served as a detachment commander for Company C, 3rd Battalion, 20th Special Forces Group. He deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

For his service to our Nation, Brunelle was decorated with two

Bronze Star Medals, three Army Commendation Medals, four Army Achievement Medals, and multiple OEF and OIF deployment ribbons. Additional recognitions included the Expert Infantryman Badge, Combat Infantryman Badge, Master Parachutist Badge, Ranger Tab, and the Special Forces Tab.

A Master Mason and president of the Tampa Bay Ranger Regiment motorcycle club, Major Brunelle was known by his community as selfless, compassionate, and full of life.

Today, Major Brunelle is survived by his wife, Renee, and many countless, loving friends and family. May God bless Major Travis Brunelle for his service to our Nation. May God bless his family, his friends, and may God bless the country he so valiantly and proudly fought for, the United States of America.

I AM STUNNED

(Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I come this morning rather stunned because I am witnessing comments by Presidential candidate Trump and Vice Presidential candidate Mike Pence that stuns me.

Today I heard that Pence basically said that Vladimir Putin has been a stronger leader in his country than Barack Obama in his country. And then, of course, Donald Trump is arguing that the Russians are not meddling in American Presidential politics, despite the fact he was interviewing on a Russian television station.

What is going on here? Is this patriotism? I don't know why all of a sudden we have a Presidential candidate who is praising or talking about basically a dictator being better than the President of the United States of America.

□ 0915

ZIKA EMERGENCY

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, have you ever heard of a travel ban on an American city? Now, we have one in the beautiful boutique district called Wynwood, in the heart of my district. It is time to lift that ban.

District 24, Miami, Florida; and the entire State have been besieged by the Zika virus. We are in the epicenter of this growing epidemic and living in fear of the damaging impact a single mosquito bite can have on an unborn fetus.

The vibrant, bustling millennial area of Wynwood has the best restaurants, the best trendy art galleries, museums, antique shops, hat stores, and tourist attractions. Tourists flock there from all over the world.

Now, with the travel ban in place because of Zika, people are being laid off;

businesses are on the verge of closing. In comparison, it is a ghost town. The unborn babies are not the only ones affected by the virus. The economy is suffering immensely.

We need your help, Mr. Speaker. Zika is taking a huge bite out of Florida's booming economy and is devastating the tourism industry.

Mr. Speaker, please bring a clean Zika bill to the floor with no riders, no poison pills; just a clean bill. The unborn, families, and the businesses of America are depending on you. Zika is an ever-evolving nightmare and we must do that. When this travel ban has been lifted, I am looking forward to saying: Business as usual in Wynwood.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The Chair would remind all Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the nominees for the Office of President and Vice President.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING THE TERRORIST AT- TACKS LAUNCHED AGAINST THE UNITED STATES ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001, ON THE 15TH ANNIVER- SARY OF THAT DATE

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Committee on Homeland Security, Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Committee on Armed Services, Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 842, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 842

Whereas, on September 11, 2001, while Americans were attending to their daily routines, terrorists hijacked four civilian aircraft, crashing two of them into the towers of the World Trade Center in New York City, a third into the Pentagon near Washington, DC, and a fourth was prevented from also being used as a weapon against America by brave passengers who placed their country above their own lives;

Whereas thousands of innocent Americans were killed and injured as a result of these attacks, including the passengers and crew of the four aircraft, workers in the World Trade Center and in the Pentagon, rescue workers, and bystanders;

Whereas the crewmembers of United Flight 175, American Flight 11, American Flight 77, and United Flight 93 acted as first responders, reporting the first intelligence of a war

the United States did not know it was fighting and sacrificing their own lives to protect the United States and the lives of countless others;

Whereas 15 years later the country continues to, and shall forever, mourn their tragic loss and honor their memory;

Whereas these attacks destroyed both towers of the World Trade Center, as well as adjacent buildings, and seriously damaged the Pentagon;

Whereas these attacks were by far the deadliest terrorist attacks ever launched against the United States, and, by targeting symbols of American strength and success, were intended to assail the principles, values, and freedoms of the United States and the American people, intimidate our Nation, and weaken its resolve;

Whereas memorials have been constructed to honor the victims of these attacks at the Pentagon, in Shanksville, Pennsylvania, and on the World Trade Center grounds, so that Americans and people from around the world can visit to mourn those lost and to pay tribute to the heroic action and sacrifice of those who have served our communities and our country in the years since the attacks;

Whereas 15 years after September 11, 2001, the United States continues to fight terrorists and other extremists who threaten America and her friends and allies;

Whereas successive Congresses have passed and President Bush and President Obama have signed numerous laws to assist victims of terrorism, protect our Nation, combat terrorism at home and abroad, and support the members of the Armed Forces who courageously defend the United States;

Whereas by the tireless efforts of our intelligence, military, and law enforcement professionals, the United States has been able to significantly degrade the al Qaeda network, by taking into custody or killing senior al Qaeda leaders, operational managers, and key facilitators, and owes a debt of gratitude to the focused and persistent efforts of all those personnel involved in the removal of Osama bin Laden;

Whereas the terrorist attacks that have occurred around the world since September 11, 2001, remind us of the hateful inhumanity of terrorism and the ongoing threat it poses to freedom, justice, and the rule of law;

Whereas United States law enforcement and intelligence agencies and allies of the United States around the world have worked together to detect and disrupt terrorist networks and numerous terror plots since September 11, 2001;

Whereas the Nation is indebted to the brave military, intelligence, law enforcement, and civilian personnel serving in Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere in advancement of United States national interests;

Whereas thousands of families have lost loved ones in the defense of freedom and liberty against the tyranny of terror; and

Whereas the passage of 15 years has not diminished the pain caused by the senseless loss of nearly 3,000 persons killed on September 11, 2001: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes September 11 as a day of solemn commemoration;

(2) extends again its deepest sympathies to the thousands of innocent victims of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, and to their families, friends, and loved ones;

(3) honors the heroism and the sacrifices of United States military and civilian personnel and their families who have sacrificed much, including their lives and health, in defense of their country;

(4) credits the heroism of first responders, law enforcement personnel, State and local officials, volunteers, and others who aided

the victims of these attacks and, in so doing, bravely risked their own lives and long-term health;

(5) expresses thanks and gratitude to the foreign leaders and citizens of all nations who have assisted and continue to stand in solidarity with the United States against terrorism in the aftermath of the attacks on September 11, 2001, and asks them to continue to stand with the United States against international terrorism;

(6) commends the military and intelligence personnel involved in the removal of Osama bin Laden;

(7) reaffirms its commitment to opposing violent extremism arrayed against American interests and to providing the United States military, intelligence, and law enforcement communities with the resources and support to do so effectively and safely;

(8) vows that it will continue to identify, intercept, and disrupt terrorists and their activities;

(9) reaffirms that the American people will never forget the sacrifices made on September 11, 2001, and will never bow to terrorist demands; and

(10) declares that when Congress adjourns today, it stands adjourned out of respect to the victims of the terrorist attacks.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ON MOTION TO RECOMMIT ON H.R. 5424, INVESTMENT ADVISERS MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2016

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting a motion to recommit on H.R. 5424 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

INVESTMENT ADVISERS MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2016

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 844, I call up the bill (H.R. 5424) to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 and to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to amend its rules to modernize certain requirements relating to investment advisers, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 844, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services, printed in the bill, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5424

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Investment Advisers Modernization Act of 2016”.

SEC. 2. MODERNIZING CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO INVESTMENT ADVISERS.

(a) INVESTMENT ADVISORY CONTRACTS.—

(1) ASSIGNMENT.—

(A) ASSIGNMENT DEFINED.—Section 202(a)(1) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-2(a)(1)) is amended by striking “; but” and all that follows and inserting “; but no assignment of an investment advisory contract shall be deemed to result from the death or withdrawal, or the sale or transfer of the interests, of a minority of the members, partners, shareholders, or other equity owners of the investment adviser having only a minority interest in the business of the investment adviser, or from the admission to the investment adviser of one or more members, partners, shareholders, or other equity owners who, after such admission, shall be only a minority of the members, partners, shareholders, or other equity owners and shall have only a minority interest in the business.”.

(B) CONSENT TO ASSIGNMENT BY QUALIFIED CLIENTS.—Section 205(a)(2) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-5(a)(2)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, except that if such other party is a qualified client (as defined in section 275.205-3 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto), such other party may provide such consent at the time the parties enter into, extend, or renew such contract”.

(2) NOT REQUIRED TO PROVIDE FOR NOTIFICATION OF CHANGE IN MEMBERSHIP OF PARTNERSHIP.—Section 205 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-5) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking the semicolon and inserting “; or”;

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “; or” and inserting a period; and

(iii) by striking paragraph (3); and

(B) in subsection (d), by striking “paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a)” and inserting “subsection (a)(2)”.

(b) ADVERTISING RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall amend section 275.206(4)-1 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to provide that paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2) of such section do not apply to an advertisement that an investment adviser publishes, circulates, or distributes solely to persons described in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(2) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—A person is described in this paragraph if such person is, or the investment adviser reasonably believes such person is—

(A) a qualified client (as defined in section 275.205-3 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations), determined as of the time of the publication, circulation, or distribution of the advertisement rather than immediately prior to or after entering into the investment advisory contract referred to in such section;

(B) a knowledgeable employee (as defined in section 270.3c-5 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations) of any private fund to which the investment adviser acts as an investment adviser;

(C) a qualified purchaser (as defined in section 2(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a))); or

(D) an accredited investor (as defined in section 230.501 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations), determined as if the investment adviser were the issuer of securities referred to in such section and the time of the publication, circulation, or distribution of the advertisement were the sale of such securities.

SEC. 3. REMOVING DUPLICATIVE BURDENS AND APPROPRIATELY TAILORING CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.

(a) BROCHURE DELIVERY.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall amend section 275.204-3(c) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to provide that an investment adviser is not required

to deliver a brochure or brochure supplement to a client that is a limited partnership, limited liability company, or other pooled investment vehicle for which each limited partner, member, or other equity owner has received, before purchasing a security issued by the pooled investment vehicle, a prospectus, private placement memorandum, or other offering document containing (to the extent material to an understanding of the pooled investment vehicle, the business of the pooled investment vehicle, and the securities being offered by the pooled investment vehicle) substantially the same information as would be required by Part 2A or 2B of Form ADV at the time of delivery of the brochure or brochure supplement, as the case may be.

(b) FORM PF.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall amend section 275.204(b)-1 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to provide that an investment adviser to a private fund is not required to report any information beyond that which is required by sections 1a and 1b of Form PF, unless such investment adviser is a large hedge fund adviser or a large liquidity fund adviser (as such terms are defined in such Form).

(c) CUSTODY RULE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall amend section 275.206(4)-2 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, as follows:

(1) The Commission shall provide additional exceptions to the independent verification requirement of paragraph (a)(4) of such section for an investment adviser with respect to funds and securities of a limited partnership (or a limited liability company or other type of pooled investment vehicle), as follows:

(A) An exception that applies if the outstanding securities (other than short-term paper, as defined in section 2(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a))) of the pooled investment vehicle are beneficially owned exclusively by—

(i) the investment adviser;

(ii) affiliated persons of the investment adviser;

(iii) supervised persons of the investment adviser;

(iv) officers, directors, and employees of the affiliated persons of the investment adviser;

(v) family members and former family members (as such terms are defined in section 275.202(a)(11)(G)-1 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations) of persons described in clause (iii) or (iv); or

(vi) officers, directors, employees, or affiliated persons of, or persons who provide, have provided, or have entered into a contract to provide services to—

(I) the investment adviser of the pooled investment vehicle;

(II) one or more clients of the investment adviser of the pooled investment vehicle; or

(III) issuers from which the pooled investment vehicle or any other client of the investment adviser of the pooled investment vehicle has acquired securities, such as the portfolio company of a private fund.

(B) An exception that applies if the pooled investment vehicle has been established to hold only the securities of a single issuer in which one or more pooled investment vehicles managed by the investment adviser have acquired a controlling interest.

(2) Consistent with, and expanding on, IM Guidance Update No. 2013-04, titled “Privately Offered Securities under the Investment Advisers Act Custody Rule”, published by the Division of Investment Management of the Commission, the Commission shall, with respect to the exception for certain privately offered securities in paragraph (b)(2) of such section—

(A) remove the requirement of clause (i)(B) of such paragraph (relating to the uncertificated nature and recordation of ownership of the securities); and

(B) remove the requirement of clause (ii) of such paragraph (relating to audit and financial

statement distribution requirements with respect to securities of pooled investment vehicles).

(d) **PROXY VOTING RULE.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall amend section 275.206(4)–6 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to provide that such section does not apply to any voting authority with respect to client securities that are not public securities.

SEC. 4. FACILITATING ROBUST CAPITAL FORMATION BY PREVENTING REGULATORY MISMATCH.

The Commission may not—

(1) amend section 230.156 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to extend the provisions of such section to offerings of securities issued by private funds; or

(2) adopt rules applicable to offerings of securities issued by private funds that are substantially the same as the provisions of such section.

SEC. 5. EXCLUSION OF ADVISORY SERVICES TO REGISTERED INVESTMENT COMPANIES.

This Act shall not apply with respect to advisory services provided, or proposed to be provided, to an investment company registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–1 et seq.).

SEC. 6. REFERENCES TO REGULATIONS.

In this Act, any reference to a regulation shall be construed to refer to such regulation or any successor thereto.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **PUBLIC SECURITY.**—The term “public security” means a security issued by an issuer that—

(A) is required to submit reports under section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(a); 78o(d)); or

(B) has a security that is listed or traded on any exchange or organized market operating in a foreign jurisdiction.

(2) **TERMS DEFINED IN INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940.**—The terms defined in section 202(a) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b–2(a)) have the meanings given such terms in such section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in part B of House Report 114–725, if offered by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5424, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act of 2016.

I represent a rural district in Virginia, Virginia's Fifth District, which stretches from Fauquier County to the North Carolina border.

As I traveled through my district during August, much as I have done throughout my time in Congress, I continued to hear hardworking Americans express concern about the current state of our economy and the economic uncertainty facing their children and grandchildren. I think every Member of this body can agree that, with millions of Americans out of work, our top focus in Congress should be on enacting policies to help spur job creation throughout our country.

Today, we are discussing several legislative efforts that, if enacted, will encourage economic growth and job creation by reducing unnecessary regulatory burdens. One of these measures is a bipartisan piece of legislation that I have been working on with Representatives FOSTER, VARGAS, STIVERS, HULTGREN, SINEMA, and others. In fact, during a June markup in the Financial Services Committee, H.R. 5424 garnered broad bipartisan support, passing by 47–12.

This measure, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act, is an effort to modernize a 76-year-old law to reflect current industry needs and standards. The legislation directs the SEC to update rules that clarify provisions within the Investment Advisers Act.

Specifically, the legislation modernizes the outdated portions of the Investment Advisers Act, such as “assignment” definition; it removes duplicative requirements, such as the notification to clients for any change in membership of a partnership; and it tailors current reporting metrics so that advisers are not required to provide burdensome and unnecessary information on their portfolio companies, among other things. Most importantly, it streamlines the regulatory scheme, while giving the SEC sufficient discretion to craft these rules to ensure investor protection. To be clear, this bill would in no way compromise investor protection, nor would it hinder the SEC's ability to pursue enforcement actions.

In our district, the investment of private capital is responsible for thousands of jobs. These critical investments allow our small businesses to innovate, expand their operations, and create jobs that our communities need.

Over the past three Congresses, there has been growing concern about the burden that Dodd-Frank unnecessarily placed on advisers to private equity, while at the same time exempting advisers to similar investment funds.

Over recent years, many of us have worked together in a bipartisan effort to eliminate the registration required

by Dodd-Frank, but this bill does not do that and would not change the registration requirement that Dodd-Frank mandated. It simply updates the Investment Advisers Act. Instead, this legislation is a pragmatic and bipartisan approach to addressing some of the concerns with the Investment Advisers Act.

No matter your views on Dodd-Frank, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act represents the view that Congress should continuously look for bipartisan, commonsense solutions to update and streamline its laws in order to encourage economic growth and job creation.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 5424, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we stand here today after an extraordinarily long recess, and Republicans' first order of business is to protect Wall Street profits instead of dealing with a host of critical issues facing the American public.

I recently visited Baton Rouge, Louisiana, where thousands of residents are still without homes and communities are struggling to recover in the wake of last month's historic devastating flooding.

There is so much that we need to do as Members of Congress to help our constituents in the short amount of time we have left in session, whether it is helping the people of Baton Rouge, ending the crisis of homelessness in America, or preventing senseless gun violence. However, rather than working together to pass sensible legislation to address these issues, we are debating H.R. 5424, a bad bill that would put Americans' savings and investments at risk by opening the door to further abuses in the private equity industry.

This is an industry that touches all of us because it is not just private businesses looking to these funds to raise capital. One-quarter of the investments held by private equity firms come from our public pension funds that are holding our teachers' and firefighters' retirement savings. And it is not just our public pensions that are on the line. It is also our emergency services and mortgages and consumer lending markets where private equity funds are increasing their presence.

That is why it is so important to have adequate oversight of this industry. We must ensure that Wall Street does not turn a profit at the expense of investors, consumers, and retirees.

Unfortunately, H.R. 5424 would roll back Dodd-Frank's much-needed oversight and transparency measures for the shadow banking industry. Dodd-Frank required advisers to private equity funds and hedge funds with more than \$150 million in assets under management to register with the SEC and

comply with important reporting and audit requirements. In addition, it required newly registered advisers to file systemic risk reports with the Financial Stability Oversight Council, because we had sufficient information on the risks that private funds could pose to our economy as a whole.

Thanks to this new oversight, the Securities and Exchange Commission has been able to examine and, where appropriate, bring enforcement actions against private fund advisers. In fact, the SEC has brought numerous enforcement actions against private fund advisers for a variety of transgressions in the past few years.

In 2013, the SEC identified violations or weaknesses in more than 50 percent of cases where it had examined how fees and expenses are handled by advisers. Recently, the SEC Director of Enforcement urged greater transparency in this area and said the Commission "will continue to aggressively bring impactful cases in this space."

All of this comes on top of recent news reports showing how private equity firms are investing in our fire departments, ambulance services, and mortgage and consumer lending markets. Their profit-driven tactics have resulted in slower reaction times in our emergency services, exorbitant interest rates, and the same sort of foreclosure abuses that we witnessed before and during the financial crisis.

So, when it comes to private equity funds and hedge funds, it is clear that more regulation is needed, not less. Yet this bill takes us in the wrong direction. For example, advisers would no longer have to notify clients of a change in ownership or provide them with information on their procedures for handling conflicts of interest in voting proxies. Additionally, they would not have to disclose information on large funds to the FSOC, making it harder to monitor and detect systemic risk.

Also troubling is that the bill would create a Bernie Madoff loophole by providing a broad exception from an annual audit requirement for funds whose investors may have a relationship with the adviser and for funds invested in private securities that are not represented by a paper certificate.

I must note that, despite efforts by my colleagues to amend this bill and remove some of its harmful provisions, there are still too many problematic provisions in this bill that would put investors, retirees, and consumers at risk. That is why it is opposed by consumer and investor advocates, State security regulators, institutional investors, and labor unions representing workers whose pensions could be affected.

Moreover, the White House has threatened to veto the bill, saying it "would enable private fund advisers to slip back into the shadows" and "unnecessarily put working and middle class families at risk, while benefiting Wall Street and other narrow special interests."

I, therefore, strongly urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 5424.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), who is the chairman of our Housing and Insurance Subcommittee.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I first would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT) for his hard work on H.R. 5424. Since joining this body, Mr. HURT has been a tireless advocate for small business creation, capital formation, and working with families across Virginia and throughout the United States. He is to be commended for his efforts.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we will consider his legislation, H.R. 5424, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act. This bill makes long-awaited and sensible changes to the 76-year-old Investment Advisers Act. H.R. 5424 also streamlines requirements for private equity funds and sophisticated investors in private equity funds.

As I said on the floor yesterday, there should be no room for regulation that serves only to appease bureaucratic demands. Capital should be used to create jobs and further growth, not fulfill meaningless and unproductive regulatory requirements.

Private equity plays a vital role in our economy. I have seen it firsthand in my district and across Missouri, and hope my colleagues recognize that private equity is responsible for saving and creating jobs in each of their congressional districts. Capital is the lifeblood of businesses.

At a time when investment returns are down and options are limited, when investment advice is more expensive and may soon be out of reach for many Americans, and when our economy continues to stagnate, we need to take measured steps to streamline regulations and free equity. That is the way you fuel an economic recovery.

This bill came to us from constituents who we have been listening to during all of the different times that we go home and talk to them. They said these are the rules and regulations that are strangling their ability to do business.

The ranking member just talked about a shadow banking system. I would argue that we have a shadow regulatory system that is producing rules and regulations at a furious clip, and without understanding the consequences of those rules and regulations.

H.R. 5424 will make modest but meaningful changes to existing law. This is a bipartisan bill that received support from the majority of the minority during the Financial Services Committee markup. It is legislation that merits support from all my colleagues, and that is because H.R. 5424 is about modernization, capital formation and, ultimately, American jobs.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his leadership on these issues and Chairman HENSARLING for bringing this bill to the floor.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 5424.

While my good friend from Illinois, Mr. FOSTER, is going to offer an amendment that would remove two of the most problematic provisions, I, unfortunately, still have serious concerns with the remaining provisions in the bill, which makes changes to core aspects of a regulatory regime that has been very successful for decades.

For one thing, this entire bill applies to more than just private equity funds. It applies to private equity funds, hedge funds, and commodity pools. So, as a threshold matter, this is not narrow or targeted relief.

I also have a problem with the provision exempting private equity advisers from the Proxy Voting Rule for private securities. The Proxy Voting Rule simply requires advisers to have a policy—just a policy—in place to deal with conflicts of interest when the adviser is voting on shareholder proposals on their clients' behalf.

Proxy voting is not limited to public companies, and conflicts of interest exist whether a company is public or private. So there is really no reason why private securities should get an exemption here.

In fact, private equity advisers are even more likely to have a conflict of interest when they are voting on shareholder proposals on a client's behalf because the entire business model of a private equity funds is premised on the funds having a significant amount of influence, if not outright control; and, in some cases, they even manage the company.

So a private equity adviser that is voting on a client's behalf would have a conflict of interest virtually every time it is faced with a proposal that is good for management, but bad for shareholders.

Requiring a private equity adviser to have policies in place to manage these conflicts of interest is really not too much to ask. We are just asking for policies to be in place.

While I think there are some very good things in this bill that are reasonable, I think too many of the provisions go too far, so I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5424, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, which was introduced by Congressman HURT. I would especially like to thank Speaker RYAN and Chairman HENSARLING for their work in bringing this up for a vote today.

Private equity has a long history of making a positive difference for Illinois companies, their employees, and our communities. Over the last 10 years, private equity firms have invested hundreds of billions of dollars in Illinois-based companies. In fact, Illinois ranked number one nationally in attracting private equity investment in 2015, according to the American Investment Council.

It comes as no surprise that these companies, backed by strong financing and experienced management, with innovative products and services, support hundreds of thousands of workers and their families.

In addition to the economic growth driven by private equity, we also shouldn't overlook its importance to investors. For example, the State Universities Retirement System of Illinois and its 200,000 members depend on investments in private equity-backed companies.

So why shouldn't we, as legislators, seize an opportunity to make private equity investment easier?

This bill would make relatively modest updates to a 76-year-old Investment Advisers Act.

Our securities laws are meant to reflect the sophistication of the investors. We should not apply cumbersome regulations intended for less-sophisticated retail investors to professionals with deep knowledge and expertise of investment advising.

The majority of private equity funds in Illinois are middle market and do not have large administrative staffs. Generally, the staff is just one or two finance professionals. The proliferation of rules, reporting, and regulation at both the Federal and State level has severely taxed these firms and taken valuable resources away from the important job of identifying, investing in and growing companies and, thus, growing our economy.

The Investment Advisers Modernization Act will reduce administrative costs, making it easier to invest in our communities, and improve the rate of return, whether they are saving for retirement or for a university's endowment.

In closing, I would like to thank Chairman HENSARLING again and Mr. HURT for their leadership on this legislation.

It is no surprise that such a common-sense bill already has a strong bipartisan record. I urge all of my colleagues to support the Investment Advisers Modernization Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, after general debate, my colleague from Illinois will offer an amendment to eliminate two toxic pro-

visions of this bill. While I am supportive of his effort, I am concerned that his amendment does not go far enough.

I am going to describe the six provisions Mr. FOSTER's amendment leaves intact but that are still harmful to investors and threatens the ability of the SEC to oversee private equity funds and hedge funds. As such, even if the amendment is adopted, I urge all Members to oppose final passage of H.R. 5424.

The first reason to vote against final passage is that H.R. 5424 would still remove systemic risk reporting requirements for private equity funds. Congress created the Financial Stability Oversight Council when it passed the Dodd-Frank Act to look for risks across the entire financial system, including those within shadow banks like private equity funds.

Democrats understood that one of the most important lessons of the crisis was the value of sunshine into all of the dark corners of our markets. We do not want another AIG to make enough risky financial bets to take down the entire economy without anyone knowing until it is too late.

H.R. 5424, however, would repeal the requirement that large private equity firms provide certain information about their portfolio companies and their leverage.

The second reason to vote "no" on an amended H.R. 5424 is that the bill still would prohibit the SEC from applying the antifraud guidance related to advertising materials of mutual funds to private equity funds and hedge funds. This is a basic investor protection.

Private equity funds should not be able to selectively use performance data to dupe investors into buying their funds. It works for mutual funds and it will work for other funds similarly.

Reason number three to oppose H.R. 5424 is that the amended bill would remove the bright-line test for fraudulent and misleading advertising materials, thereby allowing private equity advisers to use testimonials and past recommendations to create a false perception of the adviser's performance. This provision will enable private equity funds to more easily sell key securities to unsuspecting investors.

Reason number four to vote "no" is the bill would still remove the requirement that fund advisers notify investors of ownership changes. This would allow an adviser to sell its business or the fund it manages to anyone, raising the concern that an unacceptable party would suddenly be managing a pension's invested money without their consent. The public pension plans have a right to know if the star manager has been replaced with an underachiever.

An amended H.R. 5424 also would repeal disclosures of proxy voting procedures for handling conflicts of interest. Namely, the bill eliminates a requirement that advisers to private equity funds and hedge funds have policies and

procedures in place to dictate how and when the adviser will vote a proxy and how it will mitigate any conflicts of interest.

Because these policies and procedures inform investors and the SEC to whether an adviser is meeting some of its fiduciary responsibilities, I find it hard to understand how Democrats who stood up to protect the fiduciary obligations of everyday Americans can now support weakening it for the funds investing on behalf of those Americans.

Finally, even though the Foster amendment preserves the audit requirement for certificated securities, the bill would remove the audit requirement under the SEC's custody rules for private, uncertificated securities for which advisers would not have to keep any record. Although such securities may not be common in the private space, this distinction between two types of securities has all the trappings of a loophole in the making and would create a terrible incentive.

So I would urge all Members to oppose H.R. 5424 even if the Foster amendment is adopted.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

□ 0945

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I cosponsored this bill because private equity makes considerable investment in Illinois and, specifically, in my district. Nationwide, many businesses are backed by private equity and are a key driving force behind our economy, making critical national and local economic contributions. These businesses support 11 million jobs nationwide.

This bill is about applying the provisions of the Investment Advisers Modernization Act that make sense for the private equity business model. That business model involves making long-term investments in companies that a fund intends to turn around or grow over a period of years.

This bill, from the very beginning, was an effort to apply those requirements in a way that makes sense, and it is the culmination of a great deal of bipartisan work.

Working across the aisle, I have worked with Congressman HURT of Virginia to remove the provisions that my colleagues on my side of the aisle have indicated are the most troubling to them. Together, we worked on two amendments. The amendment passed in committee resulted in more than half of the Democrats on the committee supporting the bill.

Today I will be offering an amendment that will address two concerns that have been most prominently expressed by Democrats and advocates through the amendment I will be proposing and answers their main objections.

First, the amendment will address concerns over transparency into the

fund's policies. It will continue current law that the adviser is required to deliver a brochure to the client with information about fees and brokerage services and, in turn, deliver that information to the SEC.

Second, we are addressing concerns over investor confidence that funds hold the assets that they say they do. The provision that we are removing would have provided a narrow exemption to the annual audit and surprise inspection requirements for some funds, so they will continue to be subject to these after my amendment is, hopefully, adopted.

My amendment will ensure that funds continue to receive a third-party look to ensure that the fund has the assets it has represented to clients that it has, including that the asset is held in the name of the client.

I know that there are other concerns, but after careful consideration, I believe they can be addressed. Opponents say that advisers will no longer keep records of the private securities that are held in custody, but this is actually not accurate. The adviser does need to keep records. These securities are illiquid and require issuer consent to sell, and these securities will be subject to annual audit and surprise inspection.

Opponents also say that the clients might find that they have a new adviser without their consent, but current law allows for minority stakes in an adviser organized as a partnership to be done without consent. So this provision just treats an LLC and corporate structures identically.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, this bill would remove the requirement for private equity funds to submit certain information on Form PF to the FSOC; but that information is intended to capture funds that have built up leveraged and risky positions that pose a systemic risk through counterparty exposure. This is very different from the business model of private equity firms.

I know that for those Members who supported H.R. 1105 in the last Congress, this should actually be easier because it provides a very narrow, targeted relief. I voted against H.R. 1105, but I support this bill after thinking carefully about it and the changes.

The bill received the support of more than half the Democrats on the Financial Services Committee, and I hope that many more Democrats will support this bill on the floor after my amendment has been adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill that will support businesses and economic growth around the country.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, investors, consumer advocates, public pension funds, and others have spoken on H.R. 5424, and they have deemed it to be harmful.

Let me read for you a few excerpts from opposition letters received by the House of Representatives. First of all, let me tell you who they are: Americans for Financial Reform; the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees; the American Federation of Teachers; the Consumer Federation of America; Communications Workers of America; and U.S. PIRG.

"Far from modernizing the regulation of investment advisers, this legislation would roll back the clock to the years before private fund advisers were subject to elementary oversight measures, measures that numerous documented abuses have shown to be necessary for investor protection. The laundry list of regulatory exemptions in this bill would enable the exploitation of investors, possibly including outright fraud. It would also reduce the information available to regulators to address systemic risk."

North American Securities Administrators Association, Incorporated, these are our State securities regulators, the cops on the beat policing Main Street from financial crime, let me give you their quote:

"Although the bill purports to be an updating of the framework for the regulation of investment advisers, it is in fact little more than an effort to shield advisers to private funds from the scrutiny of SEC registration and examination oversight."

Let's hear what CalPERS has to say: "We believe that H.R. 5424 would erode the Dodd-Frank provisions that established greater transparency into private equity funds, protected investors against fraud by fund advisers, and enhanced the ability of regulators to effectively monitor systemic risk in the private fund industry."

CalSTRS: "This current legislation amends the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to purportedly 'modernize' certain requirements related to private equity advisers. In actuality, this proposed legislation would roll back important investor protections provided to funds, in terms of transparency and oversight by the Securities and Exchange Commission."

Let's hear from the Institutional Limited Partners Association: "The ILPA believes that the changes to mandatory disclosures and other requirements as proposed in H.R. 5424 would be counterproductive to providing institutional limited partners with the transparency they need to ensure alignment of interest in their private equity fund investments, and to carry out their duty to protect the interests of millions of beneficiaries of these investments—retirees, policyholders, nonprofit and educational institutions."

Let's hear from the Council Institutional Investors:

"H.R. 5424 rolls back important transparency and reporting requirements that we and many of our members believe are critical to investor

protection. For example, section 3(b) of H.R. 5424 would provide exceptions for private equity and hedge funds from existing disclosure requirements on Form PF, a confidential form used by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission and other regulators to track risks in the financial system."

Let's hear from Public Citizen: "This bill allows investment advisers to escape current safeguards designed to reduce inflated sales pitches or obfuscation of investment risks. Specifically, investment advisers need to make sure that potential private equity investors have basic sales documents such as the company prospectus before consummating a sale. Investors in private funds should be accorded ample information. The bill also frustrates efforts by investors to gain access to company records in so-called books-and-records requests."

Unite Here: "H.R. 5424 is an invitation for private equity managers to make false and misleading statements to the public. At a time when the nearly \$4 trillion private equity industry should become more transparent, H.R. 5424 would enable it to become more opaque, putting workers, retirees, and the general public at risk."

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING). Chairman HENSARLING has done so much to promote pro-growth policies in the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5424. I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for his leadership and the gentleman from Illinois as well.

This is a strong, bipartisan bill out of the House Financial Services Committee having passed on a vote of 47-12, which means 80 percent of the members of the House Financial Services Committee, including over half of the Democrats, support this commonsense, pro-growth, pro-jobs legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as children—including my own—all across this Nation go back to school, we would be negligent if we didn't acknowledge the latest report card that Americans received on our economy less than 2 weeks ago. The report card shows our economy growing at a measly 1.1 percent, roughly one-third of its normal growth. In other words, it has received a failing grade, Mr. Speaker. One economics writer has said the report suggests "the economy could be on the brink of recession."

Americans deserve better. Hard-working Americans do deserve better. Again, economic growth has been far stronger in our country. The economy grew on an average of 3.7 percent during every other recovery in the postwar era. But growth has averaged nearly 2 percent in the last 7 years, and even worse, about 1 percent so far this year. It is just more evidence that the economy is not working for working Americans. They have seen their paycheck

shrink, and they have seen their wages stagnate. Seven years after recession ended, nearly 14 million Americans are unemployed or underemployed.

I am confident that all of us—Republicans and Democrats alike—want this to change. We want to help Americans who are struggling, who are underemployed and unemployed. We have to lift the nearly 7 million additional Americans who have been thrown into poverty during these last 7 years. We must help them. We know—or should know—that nothing helps the poor, the unemployed, and the underemployed like economic growth. Growth means more jobs, more growth means higher average wages, more growth means less government borrowing, and growth enables Americans to achieve the dream of financial independence.

But if we want to ignite growth and revive our struggling economy, the answer is not more debt, more spending, or more onerous regulations from Washington. Instead, we need more entrepreneurs, more innovation, and more small business expansion on Main Street. So at this time, when record levels of debt and Federal regulation hinder growth and slow our economy, it is critical for us to find bipartisan solutions—not always easy to come by—that will accelerate growth and get our economy back on track.

Mr. Speaker, we have exactly that kind of bill before us today. Again, it is a bipartisan bill supported and sponsored by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT), Mr. VARGAS of California from the Democratic side of the aisle, Mr. STIVERS of Ohio from the Republican side of the aisle, and Mr. FOSTER of Illinois from the Democratic side of the aisle. I have the honor of serving with all four of these gentlemen on the House Financial Services Committee, and I thank them for their bipartisan work on this bill.

Again, this passed in our committee 47-12. Over half the Democrats on the committee support the bill—80 percent of the committee. There is no reason why every Member of the House shouldn't approve this bipartisan Investment Advisers Modernization Act because, Mr. Speaker, again, it is bipartisan, it is pragmatic, and it is commonsense. It simply updates portions of a 76-year-old law by updating regulations that have made it harder for the job growth engine of America—our small businesses—to access the capital they need to create jobs on Main Street.

□ 1000

We know, again, that small businesses across the country are struggling to find investment and financing options that enable them to open their doors, hire workers, and succeed. They are struggling, again, because of a growing regulatory burden imposed by Washington, by a Washington-knows-best mentality.

Witnesses have testified before our committee, Mr. Speaker, that there

has been a serious decline in loans from banks to small businesses over the past few years, and our Nation has gone a decade—a decade—with no growth in the value of small business loans.

It is not surprising that, during the second quarter of this year, one of every three small-business owners said they had to transfer personal assets to keep their businesses running, according to a recent report from Pepperdine University. This same report found that 50 percent of small-business owners said their growth opportunities are restricted by the current business financing environment.

As a small-business owner, my hometown of Dallas wrote me recently: “We have seen wave after wave of Federal regulations affecting our ability to grow.” Another small business owner from the town of Chandler, in the Fifth District I have the privilege of representing, summed up the economic harm caused by Washington’s regulatory burden this way: “No one can keep up.”

In order for the economy to grow for small businesses to create jobs that Americans need, we have to remove unnecessary regulations that tie up private capital and cause economic uncertainty. We must put in their place policies that encourage investment, innovation, and entrepreneurial spirit that makes America a beacon of opportunity for all.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we have a bipartisan bill before us having passed 47-12, 80 percent of our committee having approved. It is a modest, but important, step in the right direction. But as one witness told us: It will go a long way towards facilitating capital formation while maintaining our commitment to investor protection.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the bipartisan bill. By doing so, they will remove unnecessary burdens on our small businesses, and we will help grow not only the American economy but the Main Street economy as well.

I thank Members on both sides of the aisle for their bipartisan work on this very, very strong bill. And I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his leadership and for yielding the time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think I heard my colleague on the opposite side of the aisle reference Main Street, but I did not hear him describe who his Main Street is, and we don't know who he is talking about.

Let me just remind the Members one more time who is opposing this bill—this is truly representative of Main Street—AFL-CIO; American Federation of Teachers; American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees; Americans for Financial Reform; Communications Workers of America; Consumer Federation of America; Council of Institutional Investors; CalPERS; CalSTRS; Institutional Limited Partners Association; North American Securities Adminis-

trators Association; Public Citizen; UNITE HERE; United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, UAW; and U.S. Public Interest Research Group.

We have opposition from working people, from the real people of Main Street, on this legislation. I think, as Members begin to read and look at this bill, they will understand how dangerous it is and how we would be rolling back the clock, jeopardizing the reforms that we have made with Dodd-Frank, and also taking us back to undermining the SEC in extraordinary ways.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, there was an investigative series initiated by The New York Times looking into the operations of private equity firms. I would like to read for you a few key excerpts from the articles which I think might highlight the need for further regulation of private equity and not the rollbacks we see today in H.R. 5424.

This is from a June 25, 2016, article titled: “When You Dial 911 and Wall Street Answers.”

“Since the 2008 financial crisis, private equity firms, the ‘corporate raiders’ of an earlier era, have increasingly taken over a wide array of civic and financial services that are central to American life.

“Unlike other for-profit companies, which often have years of experience making a product or offering a service, private equity is primarily skilled in making money. And in many of these businesses, The Times found, private equity firms applied a sophisticated moneymaking playbook: a mix of cost cuts, price increases, lobbying and litigation.

“In emergency care and firefighting, this approach creates a fundamental tension: the push to turn a profit while caring for people in their most vulnerable moments.”

This article then goes on to describe how response times slowed and lives were put in danger—and I am talking about the response time of fire departments that are now controlled by equity funds—when these profit-hungry Wall Street firms took over essential public health services, like ensuring ambulances arrived to victims on time.

From an article titled, “How Housing’s New Players Spiraled into Banks’ Old Mistakes,” dated June 26, 2016: “When the housing crisis sent the American economy to the brink of disaster in 2008, millions of people lost their homes. The banking system had failed homeowners and their families.

“New investors soon swept in—mainly private equity firms—promising to do better.

“But some of these new investors are repeating the mistakes that banks committed throughout the housing crisis, an investigation by The New York Times has found. They are quickly foreclosing on homeowners. They are losing families’ mortgage paperwork, much as the banks did. And many of these practices were enabled by the

federal government, which sold tens of thousands of discounted mortgages to private equity investors, while making few demands on how they treated struggling homeowners.

"The rising importance of private equity in the housing market is one of the most consequential transformations of the post-crisis American financial landscape. A home, after all, is the single largest investment most families will ever make.

"Private equity firms, and the mortgage companies they own, face less oversight than the banks. And yet they are the cleanup crew for the worst housing crisis since the Great Depression."

The article then goes on to describe how private equity firms can squeeze fees out of homeowners during every stage of the foreclosure process, often through conflicts of interest that make foreclosure more profitable than providing sustainable loan modifications.

Mr. Speaker, this investigated series by The New York Times exposes practices that I think no credible Member of Congress would want to be associated with. This is horrible that we could even think that we are allowing our citizens to be placed at risk and their lives jeopardized because we have a private equity firm that is brought up and is now in control of critical services to our citizens, and they have to do it and make a profit. The way they make that profit is they cut back on personnel, equipment, machinery, or whatever it takes to turn that dollar.

I am absolutely amazed that any Member of Congress would dare to think about supporting this kind of legislation that would allow these practices not only to continue in ways that I have described, and let me just remind you, I don't know how we can soon forget the crisis that this country experienced in 2008 when we had this subprime meltdown and we had so many foreclosures, so many families that were literally put on the streets because they lost their home because of practices that were not regulated by this government.

This is amazing. This is absolutely amazing, and it is outrageous. I believe when the Members who come to vote today take a look at the fine print that they will understand what is happening here today. I think even if some Members thought they could, or should, support this bill, I think they are going to change their minds. And while it is being touted as a bipartisan effort, I don't think so.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT).

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be here today to talk about what is very essential in America, and that is getting people to work and creating opportunities.

Small businesses are essential to America's economic competitiveness.

Not only do they employ half the Nation's private sector, but they also create two-thirds of the net jobs in our country.

Unfortunately, in recent years, small businesses have been slow to recover from a recession and credit crisis that has hit them especially hard. Unlike large enterprises that can obtain funds from commercial debt and equity markets, small businesses must often rely on their own personal assets, retained earnings, community banks, and credit unions for needed capital.

Last month, in the great city of Santa Clarita, I hosted my annual small business conference and expo. The conference was designed to hear from constituents exactly what was happening and their problems in small businesses. After listening to small-business owners and employees talk about the challenges they face, it was very evident that overregulation and lack of access to capital were the biggest issues.

That is why I applaud and support Mr. HURT's work on H.R. 5424, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act of 2016. The Investment Advisers Act has proven to be a duplicative burden that not only drives up costs but also blocks an efficient allocation of capital.

We need to modernize these laws so that we can remove existing barriers and tailor our policy to help facilitate capital formation. H.R. 5424 would do exactly that. The legislation takes into consideration the business model of today's private equity and not one from 70 years ago.

I look forward to continuing my work with Mr. HURT, and with all of my colleagues here in the House, on commonsense measures like the Investment Advisers Modernization Act of 2016, so that we can ensure our small businesses can grow and employ more of our neighbors.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 5424, and ask my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill because access to capital is not a partisan issue, it is something that we need and will help our small businesses.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as such time as I may consume.

I will remind the Members that NANCY PELOSI, our leader, has weighed in on this pretty heavily. She doesn't weigh in on a lot of things, but she has put out an advisory here today titled: H.R. 5424, a House GOP giveaway to the shadow banking industry.

We have from the administration that a Presidential veto will take place on this legislation should it get to his desk.

This morning's debate illustrates Republican's misguided priorities. When we are here in Washington, the American public expects us to address the pressing needs of our Nation and not waste our time with Wall Street giveaways that the financial crisis taught us is neither prudent nor without devastating consequences.

Why is it that the interest of Wall Street takes high priority when we return from our break?

□ 1015

Why aren't we talking about homelessness? Why aren't we talking about Flint? Why aren't we talking about Zika? Why aren't we talking about Baton Rouge?

I will tell you that there are those who think, perhaps, they have to take care of Wall Street, that it comes first, but I do not think so. I ask for a "no" vote on this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I urge all of the Members of this body to support this good bill.

Let's remember where we started with this registration requirement for private equity. In the Dodd-Frank Act, in the aftermath of the financial crisis, private equity was swept into the Dodd-Frank Act in an effort, ostensibly, to try to stop future systemic crises in the United States' markets. As a consequence, over the last couple of years, we have introduced legislation to repeal that registration requirement. This bill does not do that. Those efforts were bipartisan in nature. They were designed to promote more investment in jobs across this country, but that was met with resistance. Registration is now a fact of life. There are Members on the other side who did not support our previous efforts, Mr. FOSTER being one of them.

As has been said, we have more than half of the Democrats on the Financial Services Committee supporting this legislation because it is not a repeal of the registration requirement. What it is, in fact, is a streamlining of a 76-year-old law that has made it more difficult for investment funds to be able to be successful.

This bill is not about rolling back investor protection. In fact, investor protection will still be strong. The SEC has the power to bring enforcement actions. Nothing has been done, again, to repeal the registration requirement. These firms will still continue to have to be registered. This is not about investor protection. All of the antifraud provisions that are currently in Federal securities law will continue to apply.

This is about teachers. It is about firefighters. This is about the pension funds in these investment funds that have had success over the last 10 years. These have been the places where these pension funds have, in fact, invested because they have been solid-performing funds. That is good for teachers and firefighters and their retirements. That is what this bill is about. It is about making it easier for these funds to be successful so that they can bring back those returns for the retirements of our teachers and our firefighters.

At the end of the day, probably as important as anything to me are the

jobs that are created all across this country because of the investments of these funds—places like Main Street in Martinsville, Virginia, where we have seen, over the last 15 years, unemployment as high as 25 percent. There have been investments in places like Southside, Virginia, that have created jobs, that have grown companies.

That is what this bill is about. It is about those jobs in Martinsville, Virginia. It is about those families in Martinsville, Virginia, or in Rocky Mount, or in Charlottesville, in Virginia's Fifth District. That is what this bill is about. That is why it has garnered strong bipartisan support on our committee, and I hope it will garner strong bipartisan support today on this floor. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5424, the so-called "Investment Advisers Modernization Act of 2016." Regrettably, instead of modernizing the regulation of investment advisors, as the bill's title suggests, the legislation under consideration today would take us back to a time when there was minimal transparency and reporting requirements for private firms such as private equity and hedge funds.

Over the past few months, I have been following the New York Times investigative series that exposed abuses by the private equity industry that impact our daily lives. I am concerned that private equity firms are now overtaking our fire departments, our ambulance services, our public water services, and our mortgage market. The influence of these private firms in services that traditionally have been provided by our government is resulting in slower reaction times for emergency services, aggressive collection practices, and the type of foreclosure abuse that we saw before the 2008 financial crisis. Given the increased influence of these firms in our daily lives, it is critical that we do not roll back crucial oversight and transparency requirements through this legislation.

I served on the Financial Services Committee during the 2008 financial crisis. I witnessed the harmful impact that the lack of regulation had on hard-working families around our nation. I had the honor of helping to reform our financial system through the enactment of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (The Dodd-Frank Act). The Dodd-Frank Act increased the transparency of private funds by requiring increased reporting and compliance requirements.

Unfortunately, this legislation would destroy much of the hard work we did through the Dodd-Frank Act. According to Americans for Financial Reform, the regulatory exemptions included in this bill would enable the exploitation of investors and would reduce the information available to regulators to address systemic risk. Specifically, this harmful legislation removes certain requirements made applicable by the Dodd-Frank Act to investment advisers to private equity funds and hedge funds, so that they do not have to notify their investors of ownership changes, report certain informa-

tion on large private equity funds in their systemic risk reports to the Financial Stability Oversight Council, or annually deliver plain-text disclosures to clients. It also exempts these private funds from the annual independent audit requirement, which was strengthened by the Securities and Exchange Commission following the Bernie Madoff scandal.

A quarter of the investments in private equity funds comes from public pensions, which invest the retirement savings of our nation's teachers and firefighters. We cannot repeal these important protections for our nation's public servants.

In closing, this harmful bill would provide regulatory relief for an industry that needs more regulation. It is a dangerous step in the wrong direction. This is why I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT PRINTED IN PART B OF HOUSE REPORT 114-725 OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, strike line 14 and all that follows through page 7, line 5.

Page 7, strike line 18 and all that follows through "Consistent with" on page 9, line 16, and insert "Regulations, consistent with".

Page 9, beginning on line 20, strike "the Commission shall."

Page 9, line 23, insert ", so as to" after "such section".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 844, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Virginia (Mr. HURT) for working with me on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment that I am proposing addresses two of the concerns that have been most prominently expressed by Democrats and advocates, including the two major objections that the administration's statement, which opposed this bill before the amendment, highlighted. I hope this will lead most of the Caucus to join me in voting for this bipartisan bill after my amendment addresses the chief concerns voiced by my colleagues.

First, the amendment will address concerns over transparency into the fund's policies. It will continue current law that the adviser is required to deliver a brochure to the client with information about fees and brokerage services and, in turn, deliver that information to the SEC.

Second, my amendment will address concerns over investor confidence that the funds hold the assets that they say they do. It removes a provision that would have provided a narrow exemption from the annual audit or surprise

inspection requirements for some funds; so they will now, with this amendment, continue to be fully subject to annual audits and surprise inspections. My amendment will ensure that the funds continue to receive a third-party look to confirm the assets it has represented to clients, including that the asset is actually held in the name of the client.

These are the two concerns most prominently expressed, but I know there are others.

After careful consideration, I do not believe that they are problematic or should prevent Members from supporting this bill. The adviser does need to keep records on the securities in its custody. The securities eligible to be held in its custody are illiquid and will be subject to the annual audit or surprise inspection. Funds that have built up leveraged and risky positions that could pose a systemic risk through counterparty exposure and other mechanisms will still be required to submit the additional information on Form PF to the FSOC.

My amendment will remove the provisions that had been the main features for the opposition during this process, so I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I commend Representative FOSTER and his staff for working with us on this measure and for making it a truly bipartisan effort, for which I am grateful.

This amendment is simple; yet, much like the amendment that was offered by Representative FOSTER during the July markup of this bill, it helps alleviate some outstanding concerns, and it helps ensure that the legislation continues to gain bipartisan support.

This amendment would remove two sections:

First, it would remove the brochure delivery changes that were made a part of this bill. While I believe the private fund sponsors already disclose substantial information in their private placement memoranda, which are included in the books and records requirements that advisers are required to maintain, there was concern that removing the requirement that advisers complete and deliver a brochure and a brochure supplement to a client that is a limited partnership or otherwise would make it more difficult for the SEC to conduct examinations and compile information.

The second change would remove the first part of the custody rule changes

that were made in the bill. The legislation would, as reported, require the SEC to provide additional exemptions to the custody rule, which will generally require an adviser of a pooled investment vehicle to have an independent accountant conduct surprise or scheduled audits every year of its clients' funds and securities. While I believe that the proposed exemption is carefully tailored to limit its scope to persons with whom the fund sponsor has a close relationship, there were concerns about the level of connectedness and how far current SEC staff guidance could be extended. This is an issue that should continue to be evaluated as, I believe, the current SEC guidance is too narrow, and the cost of the audit is often greater than the investor protection it provides.

While I think there are serious policy merits to the legislation as reported, I do think that these two changes that have been proposed by Mr. FOSTER alleviate some concerns and help make the bill even more bipartisan than it was when it received the strong vote that it did in the Financial Services Committee. I support this amendment, and I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) for offering this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you to Chairman HENSARLING, Ranking Member WATERS, and Congressmen HURT, FOSTER, VARGAS, and STIVERS for all of their work on this bipartisan legislation to streamline the antiquated regulatory framework for private equity fund advisers while maintaining appropriate industry oversight and investor protections.

Private equity investors across the country provide billions of dollars each year to Main Street businesses, and over 11 million Americans work for private equity-backed businesses. Last year alone, private equity firms invested an estimated \$18 billion in more than 60 Arizona-based companies. Together, these companies support over 130,000 workers and their families.

GoDaddy is the world's largest domain name register with more than 12 million customers, and like thousands of large and small American businesses, GoDaddy is a private equity-backed company. Last month, I visited their Tempe, Arizona, facility in my district. It is a state-of-the-art complex that promotes collaboration and innovation, and it employs over 1,000 Arizonans, including engineers, developers, and small business consultants. With the help and investment of private equity, GoDaddy will create hundreds of quality technology jobs for years to come.

By providing narrowly targeted regulatory relief to private equity fund advisers, this legislation improves the flow of capital to businesses in every community and in every district in the United States. This bill passed out of the House Financial Services Committee on a bipartisan vote. Following the committee vote, we worked together on a bipartisan fix to address two specific concerns.

First, the amendment strikes the bill's narrow exemption from the annual audit or surprise inspection requirements for some funds, ensuring that investors are able to verify that funds actually contain particular investments as claimed. Second, the amendment ensures that advisers will continue to deliver a plain language narrative brochure annually to both clients and the SEC.

All currently registered investment advisers remain subject to SEC registration and examination and the antifraud provisions of the Investment Advisers Act. This legislation does not reduce the SEC's authority to examine or to bring enforcement actions against private fund managers or eliminate any of the tools that the SEC has to pursue such actions. Further, private equity funds invest in companies for several years and, therefore, do not present systemic risks.

Private equity-backed businesses are a key driving force behind our economy, making critical national and local economic contributions. We must work together to create an environment that enables these companies to grow and succeed and expand opportunities for hardworking Americans.

Thank you again to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their work on this important legislation.

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Foster amendment that has been offered by my good friend and colleague from Illinois, and I thank him for his hard work in responding to concerns that the Democrats raised. I thank Chairman HENSARLING for accepting the amendment and Congressman HURT for accepting the amendment.

This amendment removes a provision in the bill that would exempt certain funds from the annual audit requirement of the custody rule. The custody rule is a longstanding investor protection that guards against outright theft of clients' funds, so I think that is a very huge burden of proof if you want to even think about rolling it back.

There are so many ways to comply with the custody rule, but this bill without the Foster amendment would allow certain advisers to be exempt from having an annual audit, from having an annual surprise exam, and the requirement to hold a client's securi-

ties at an independent qualified custodian. In other words, it would exempt certain advisers from all of the protections of the custody rule. I think that is a bridge too far, and I am so pleased that Mr. FOSTER's amendment would remove this provision. It makes it a much better bill.

I still have concerns about the remaining provisions of the bill, but I think that this amendment is a huge step in the right direction, and I urge my colleagues to support the Foster amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I close simply by saying that I have certainly appreciated being able to work with Mr. FOSTER on this over the last several months. I appreciate his leadership on the issue, and I hope this body will approve this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1030

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. TORRES. I am opposed in its current form.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Torres moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5424 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 8. REPORT ON EMERGENCY VEHICLE RESPONSE TIMES OF COMPANIES OWNED BY PRIVATE FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 204(b) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-4(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(12) REPORT ON EMERGENCY VEHICLE RESPONSE TIMES OF COMPANIES OWNED BY PRIVATE FUNDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each investment adviser required to file annual or other reports under this section and who advises a private fund that owns a controlling interest in an emergency services company shall, not less often than annually, disclose to the Commission—

“(i) the change in the average response time of emergency vehicles since the private fund acquired a controlling interest in the emergency services company, disaggregated

by the response times of emergency vehicles deployed to—

“(I) rural areas; and

“(II) urban areas;

“(ii) if a required response time is established by a contract for emergency services between the emergency services company and a unit of local government or by an ordinance of a unit of local government, the percentage of response times of emergency vehicles deployed by the emergency services company to that unit of local government that do not meet such requirement; and

“(iii) if the response times failed to meet the required response time described under clause (ii), a description of the impact of such failure on the value of the emergency services company to the private fund.

“(B) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph:

“(i) EMERGENCY SERVICES COMPANY.—The term ‘emergency services company’ means a company that provides ambulance, firefighter, or other emergency services in response to 9-1-1 calls.

“(ii) EMERGENCY VEHICLE.—The term ‘emergency vehicle’ means an ambulance, fire engine, or other vehicle deployed in response to a 9-1-1 call.”

(b) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Commission shall issue regulations to carry out paragraph (12) of section 204(b) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as added by subsection (a).

Mrs. TORRES (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, this is a final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, a June 26 New York Times article revealed some of the troubling consequences of private equity firms taking over local emergency services.

According to the article, since the 2008 financial crisis, private equity firms are investing in growing numbers in emergency services companies, sometimes with disastrous results. The piece found cases where emergency response times were so slow, personnel even had time for a cigarette break before arriving to the scene.

Some emergency services companies also reported mismanagement, specifically, that their parent companies are not able to pay their salaries or restock ambulances with critical medical supplies.

My amendment will make sure that there is accountability and transparency when private equity firms invest in emergency services. My amendment will not prohibit private equity funds from investing in these services or place any restrictions on how they choose to invest, nor will it deny the fact that private equity has and can play an important role in investing in companies in communities across our

country. It would simply provide reassurance to our constituents that when they call 911, their lives won't be put at risk because their local fire or ambulance service wants to turn a profit.

This motion to recommit would require private equity firms to report the change in response time of emergency vehicles since the private fund acquired a controlling interest in the emergency services company. Additionally, the report will require data on the percent of emergency response times that violate contracts entered into by local governments and emergency services companies and include an explanation as to why response times did not meet requirements set out in such contracts.

At a time when local jurisdictions are struggling to make ends meet and the demands on emergency services are only growing, there is certainly a role for private equity firms to play in making sure our constituents have the services they need and expect. But if a private equity firm decides to invest in an emergency service company, they also take on the responsibility to provide those services to the best of their capacity.

As a former 911 dispatcher, I know that when it comes to getting emergency personnel to those in need, every second matters. There is no margin of error, and under absolutely no circumstances should profit come before saving lives.

I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am just curious where this amendment was during the bipartisan process to bring H.R. 5424 to the floor. I am curious where it was in our committee deliberations. I am curious why it was never presented to the Rules Committee and we are just seeing it now.

Again, H.R. 5424, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act, is a bipartisan piece of legislation to make sure our small businesses, entrepreneurs, and innovators can access capital. It passed the committee 49-12. More than half of the Democrats supported it.

Now we have a motion to recommit that moves it in the complete opposite direction—one more disclosure, disclaimer, more job-killing regulations to be put upon those who are trying to fund our small businesses, to try to help the working poor better themselves, to try to help improve the paychecks and the well-being of middle-income America.

It is time to reject the motion to recommit. Let's work on a bipartisan

basis. Let's pass H.R. 5424. Vote down the motion to recommit. Vote for the bipartisan bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 36 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1105

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia) at 11 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m.

JUSTICE AGAINST SPONSORS OF TERRORISM ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2040) to deter terrorism, provide justice for victims, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2040

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) International terrorism is a serious and deadly problem that threatens the vital interests of the United States.

(2) International terrorism affects the interstate and foreign commerce of the United States by harming international trade and market stability, and limiting international travel by United States citizens as well as foreign visitors to the United States.

(3) Some foreign terrorist organizations, acting through affiliated groups or individuals, raise significant funds outside of the United States for conduct directed and targeted at the United States.

(4) It is necessary to recognize the substantive causes of action for aiding and abetting and conspiracy liability under chapter 113B of title 18, United States Code.

(5) The decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in *Halberstam v. Welch*, 705 F.2d 472 (D.C. Cir. 1983), which has been widely recognized as the leading case regarding Federal civil aiding and abetting and conspiracy liability, including by the Supreme Court of the United States, provides the proper legal framework for how such liability should function in the context of chapter 113B of title 18, United States Code.

(6) Persons, entities, or countries that knowingly or recklessly contribute material support or resources, directly or indirectly, to persons or organizations that pose a significant risk of committing acts of terrorism that threaten the security of nationals of the United States or the national security, foreign policy, or economy of the United States, necessarily direct their conduct at the United States, and should reasonably anticipate being brought to court in the United States to answer for such activities.

(7) The United States has a vital interest in providing persons and entities injured as a result of terrorist attacks committed within the United States with full access to the court system in order to pursue civil claims against persons, entities, or countries that have knowingly or recklessly provided material support or resources, directly or indirectly, to the persons or organizations responsible for their injuries.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this Act is to provide civil litigants with the broadest possible basis, consistent with the Constitution of the United States, to seek relief against persons, entities, and foreign countries, wherever acting and wherever they may be found, that have provided material support, directly or indirectly, to foreign organizations or persons that engage in terrorist activities against the United States.

SEC. 3. RESPONSIBILITY OF FOREIGN STATES FOR INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM AGAINST THE UNITED STATES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 97 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1605A the following:

“§ 1605B. Responsibility of foreign states for international terrorism against the United States

“(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term ‘international terrorism’—

“(1) has the meaning given the term in section 2331 of title 18, United States Code; and

“(2) does not include any act of war (as defined in that section).

“(b) **RESPONSIBILITY OF FOREIGN STATES.**—

A foreign state shall not be immune from the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States in any case in which money damages are sought against a foreign state for physical injury to person or property or death occurring in the United States and caused by—

“(1) an act of international terrorism in the United States; and

“(2) a tortious act or acts of the foreign state, or of any official, employee, or agent of that foreign state while acting within the scope of his or her office, employment, or agency, regardless where the tortious act or acts of the foreign state occurred.

“(c) **CLAIMS BY NATIONALS OF THE UNITED STATES.**—Notwithstanding section 2337(2) of title 18, a national of the United States may bring a claim against a foreign state in accordance with section 2333 of that title if the foreign state would not be immune under subsection (b).

“(d) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—A foreign state shall not be subject to the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States under subsection (b) on the basis of an omission or a tortious act or acts that constitute mere negligence.”.

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) The table of sections for chapter 97 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1605A the following:

“1605B. Responsibility of foreign states for international terrorism against the United States.”.

(2) Subsection 1605(g)(1)(A) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting “or section 1605B” after “but for section 1605A”.

SEC. 4. AIDING AND ABETTING LIABILITY FOR CIVIL ACTIONS REGARDING TERRORIST ACTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2333 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) **LIABILITY.**—

“(1) **DEFINITION.**—In this subsection, the term ‘person’ has the meaning given the term in section 1 of title 1.

“(2) **LIABILITY.**—In an action under subsection (a) for an injury arising from an act of international terrorism committed, planned, or authorized by an organization that had been designated as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189), as of the date on which such act of international terrorism was committed, planned, or authorized, liability may be asserted as to any person who aids and abets, by knowingly providing substantial assistance, or who conspires with the person who committed such an act of international terrorism.”.

(b) **EFFECT ON FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITIES ACT.**—Nothing in the amendment made by this section affects immunity of a foreign state, as that term is defined in section 1603 of title 28, United States Code, from jurisdiction under other law.

SEC. 5. STAY OF ACTIONS PENDING STATE NEGOTIATIONS.

(a) **EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION.**—The courts of the United States shall have exclusive jurisdiction in any action in which a foreign state is subject to the jurisdiction of a court of the United States under section 1605B of title 28, United States Code, as added by section 3(a) of this Act.

(b) **INTERVENTION.**—The Attorney General may intervene in any action in which a foreign state is subject to the jurisdiction of a court of the United States under section 1605B of title 28, United States Code, as added by section 3(a) of this Act, for the purpose of seeking a stay of the civil action, in whole or in part.

(c) **STAY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A court of the United States may stay a proceeding against a foreign state if the Secretary of State certifies that the United States is engaged in good faith discussions with the foreign state defendant concerning the resolution of the claims against the foreign state, or any other parties as to whom a stay of claims is sought.

(2) **DURATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A stay under this section may be granted for not more than 180 days.

(B) **EXTENSION.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Attorney General may petition the court for an extension of the stay for additional 180-day periods.

(ii) **RECERTIFICATION.**—A court shall grant an extension under clause (i) if the Secretary of State recertifies that the United States remains engaged in good faith discussions with the foreign state defendant concerning the resolution of the claims against the foreign state, or any other parties as to whom a stay of claims is sought.

SEC. 6. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or any amendment made by this Act, or the application of

a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid, the remainder of this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provisions and amendments to any other person not similarly situated or to other circumstances, shall not be affected by the holding.

SEC. 7. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply to any civil action—

(1) pending on, or commenced on or after, the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) arising out of an injury to a person, property, or business on or after September 11, 2001.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials to S. 2040, under current consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act has been introduced over several successive Congresses and has twice passed the Senate. Over the years that this legislation has been considered, I have worked with its sponsors to make the bill's language more precise in order to ensure that any unintended consequences are kept to a minimum.

In particular, I have worked to make sure that JASTA's extension of secondary liability under the Anti-Terrorism Act closely tracks the common law standard for aiding and abetting liability and is limited to State Department-designated foreign terrorist organizations.

Secondary liability should only attach to persons who have actual knowledge that they are directly providing substantial assistance to a designated foreign terrorist organization in connection with the commission of an act of international terrorism. JASTA, as revised in the Senate Judiciary Committee, ensures that aiding and abetting liability is limited in this manner.

In addition to the Anti-Terrorism Act, JASTA amends the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act to waive the sovereign immunity of any country that sponsors an act of international terrorism that causes physical injury on U.S. soil.

JASTA makes this change because, under current law, a foreign nation can provide financing and other substantial assistance for a terrorist attack in our country and escape liability so long as the support is provided overseas.

For example, under current law, if the intelligence agency of a foreign government handed a terrorist a bag of money in New York City to support an attack on U.S. soil, the country would be liable under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act's tort exception right now. However, if we change the fact pattern slightly so that, rather than giving a terrorist money in New York City, the money is provided in Paris, the foreign state will not be subject to liability in U.S. courts.

This is a troubling loophole in our antiterrorism laws to say that a terrorist attack occurring in the United States, a tort occurring in the United States on U.S. citizens, would not allow U.S. citizens access to their own courts for a tort that occurred in their own country.

When Congress enacted the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act in 1976, it put in place a broad set of exceptions to sovereign immunity, including an exception for tort claims involving injuries occurring in the United States. However, the courts have not consistently interpreted those exceptions in such a manner that they cover the sponsoring of a terrorist attack on U.S. soil.

JASTA addresses this inconsistency with a concrete rule that is consistent with the nine, longstanding exceptions to foreign sovereign immunity already provided for under U.S. law.

JASTA ensures that those, including foreign governments, who sponsor terrorist attacks on U.S. soil are held fully accountable for their actions. We can no longer allow those who injure and kill Americans to hide behind legal loopholes, denying justice to the victims of terrorism.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) control the balance of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from New York, a senior member of the committee with whom I have worked for many years, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the September 11, 2001, terrorist attack on the United States was the deadliest foreign attack on American soil in our Nation's history. Its impact has been immeasurable, as evidenced by the fact that we are still grappling with the cultural and policy implications stemming from the events of that day. And, 15 years on, most Americans continue to feel its searing emotional impact, particularly as the anniversary date approaches this Sunday. This is especially true for those who lost loved ones or were injured as a result of this horrific attack. They

deserve our deepest sympathy and our help.

So it is in this vein that we consider S. 2040, the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act, which, among other things, amends the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976 to create a new exception to the act's general grant of foreign sovereign immunity.

The Judiciary Committee held a hearing on this bill last July, at which the bill's supporters presented compelling and sympathetic arguments in favor of ensuring that the 9/11 families have access to a well-deserved day in court. At the same time, however, the administration and others raised a number of concerns about the bill's potential impact that we should keep in mind.

First, the administration, some allied nations, and others, assert that the enactment of S. 2040 may lead to retaliation by other countries against the United States, given the breadth of our interests and the expansive reach of our global activities.

Secondly, they assert that the bill will hamper cooperation from other nations because they may become more reluctant to share sensitive intelligence, in light of the greater risk that such information may be revealed in litigation.

Moreover, they raise the concern that the bill, effectively, would allow private litigants rather than the government to determine foreign and national security policy questions like which states are sponsors of terrorism.

Because of the moral imperative of enacting legislation and the seriousness of the concerns raised, I remain hopeful that we can continue to work with the administration to resolve these issues so that legislation can be signed into law by the President.

I also want to acknowledge Representatives PETER KING and, particularly, JERROLD NADLER, and Senators JOHN CORNYN and CHARLES SCHUMER for their tireless leadership and efforts to achieve congressional passage of this measure. There is no doubt as to the passion they bring for advocating for victims of the September 11, 2001, attacks—a passion that I, and many others, share.

□ 1115

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee, and welcome him back.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Sunday marks 15 years since America was viciously attacked in 2001. Everyone remembers what they were doing. I was driving my Jeep to the courthouse in Texas, where I was a judge. People stopped on the side of the road because they were listening to the radio about how planes were used as a weapon to attack our Nation.

Three thousand Americans and people from other nations were murdered

at the hands of evil, malicious terrorists, and our country changed forever that day. The lives of those families especially changed, those families that suffered loved ones who were killed and injured and are still injured today.

Meanwhile, we are here debating whether or not these families of the victims deserve their basic right, under the Constitution of the U.S., to their day in court, the right to sue the perpetrators. I don't think there should be much dissenting on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, if any foreign government, if it can be shown to have supported a terrorist attack on U.S. soil, American victims ought to have the right to sue that country. Based on the 28 pages held secret for years, there may be evidence that the country of Saudi Arabia and their officials may have had some involvement in planning the elements of that attack. I don't know. That is what the courtroom is for. Whether this involvement rises to the level to be held accountable at trial is an issue for a jury of Americans to decide.

It is interesting that Saudi Arabia objects to this legislation. Methinks they object too much.

Like any other issue, we should let a jury decide the damages, what they should be, whether there should be any at all. The legislation gives the victims' families access to the courts, to the rule of law, and we, as a people, should be more concerned about these victims of terror than we are about diplomatic niceties with other countries.

The voices of the murdered cry out for us to do justice, and justice has been waiting too long; 15 years for justice.

Mr. Speaker, justice is what we do in this country, and that is what these victims and their families want.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), who has been working on this issue for such a long time.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of JASTA. I am proud to be the lead Democratic sponsor of this bill, alongside my friend from New York (Mr. KING), and I appreciate all of his hard work on this legislation.

On Sunday, we will observe the 15th anniversary of the September 11 terrorist attacks, when thousands of Americans were brutally murdered in my district in New York, as well as at the Pentagon, and in Shanksville, Pennsylvania. JASTA would help ensure that those responsible for aiding and abetting those attacks are held accountable for their actions.

Unfortunately, because of certain court decisions misinterpreting the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act and the Anti-Terrorism Act, the 9/11 victims and their families have been unable to pursue their claims in court

against some of the parties they believe were responsible for funding the attacks.

JASTA simply reinstates what was understood to be the law for 30 years, that foreign states may be brought to justice for aiding and abetting acts of international terrorism that occur on American soil, whether or not the conduct that facilitated the attack occurred in the United States.

Think of it this way: some courts have held that if a foreign government agent hands over a \$1 million check to al Qaeda in a cafe in New York in order to fund a terrorist attack in the United States, that government can be sued in an American court. But if that same foreign agent funds the same attack by handing over the same \$1 million check in a cafe in Geneva, his government should be immune from liability.

That makes no sense, and it flies in the face of what had been settled law for many years. We must correct these erroneous court decisions so that anyone who facilitates a terrorist attack on our people can be brought to justice.

Let me be clear. This legislation does not prejudice the merits of any particular case. It simply ensures that the 9/11 families, or anyone who may face the same situation, can plead their case in court.

Some critics of this bill have argued that if we pass it, other nations may retaliate by enacting similar laws that could subject Americans, or the United States itself, to liability in those countries. I find this argument unpersuasive. The United States does not engage in international terrorist activity and would not face any legal jeopardy if a law like JASTA were enacted anywhere else.

Furthermore, the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, and its well-established tort exception, have been the law for 40 years. In that time, we simply have not seen the parade of horrors that some critics imagine would happen if this bill were to become law.

We cannot allow threats from a country that fears being held to account for its actions, and may threaten retaliation of some sort, to deny victims of terrorist attacks their day in court. Moreover, this legislation contains a reasonable provision allowing for a stay of court proceedings if the President is engaging in good faith negotiations to resolve the claim through diplomatic channels.

We need not fear retaliation from another country. This is not the 1790s. The United States is a major power and can hold our own.

JASTA is a narrow bill that has been carefully negotiated over the last 6 years, and which passed the Senate unanimously in May. It would provide clarity to the courts, and justice to the victims of 9/11, and it deserves swift passage today.

I urge all my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 3

minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. KING of New York. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great day for America. Let me, at the outset, commend Chairman GOODLATTE for the outstanding work that he has done, for always keeping his word, for being a person we could always count on to do what had to be done, and always told us what he was doing, and always carried everything out. So I thank BOB very much.

Let me thank the Speaker of the House, Mr. RYAN; the Majority Leader, Mr. MCCARTHY; the Democratic leaders, NANCY PELOSI and STENY HOYER; and my good friend, JERRY NADLER, for being there from day one.

Also, let me thank former Congressman Dan Lungren, who was the original lead sponsor of this bill going back several years.

Let me also thank the 9/11 families for the fact that they have never, ever yielded. They have never stepped back. They have always kept this issue on the front burner at a time when too many Americans choose to look the other way.

I especially want to thank Terry Strada and the great work that she has done. Her husband, Tom, her father-in-law, Ernie, and her mother-in-law, Mary Ann, are very good friends. I want to again thank her for the job that she did. And her husband, certainly she is carrying on his name; and Terry, I thank you for that.

This is essential. It is essential that justice be done. It is essential that 9/11 families have the right to bring action in American courts. As Judge POE said, this is the most basic constitutional right. This is an obligation. It is an obligation we, in the Congress, have to not allow foreign lobbyists or foreign countries or anyone else to intimidate us.

Justice must be done, and we want to make sure that there are no more 9/11s. This is one more step we can take to show foreign governments they cannot step aside, they cannot walk away when something is carried out, where they are sort of looking the other way to make believe it is not happening.

I am not prejudging the case, but the fact is the 9/11 families have the right to have this resolved in court, and I am proud to stand with them.

I want to commend my colleague, DAN DONOVAN. From the day he arrived here in Congress, this has been a major issue for him. The Zadroga Act and JASTA is what propels him and certainly has motivated me.

So, again, I want to thank all the 9/11 families for all the work they have done. It is a bipartisan effort. It is an American effort, and we can be very proud as we go into the 15th anniversary of the most horrible day in America that we have not given up the fight. We will continue to fight and we will win.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for all of his hard work on this bill and others.

I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for his hard work in helping to bring it to the floor. I thank my colleagues from New York, Congressmen KING and NADLER, for their hard work.

This is an important, important bill, and I rise today, 2 days before the 15th anniversary of 9/11, to express my strong support for the passage of the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act.

The attacks of 9/11 were acts of appalling cruelty. They targeted, knowingly and specifically, innocent Americans who just got up and went to work like every other American and were killed on 9/11.

Though the hijackers of those planes died that day, it is virtually indisputable that people who conspired with them in the planning, preparation, execution, and financing of those horrific acts walk the streets freely in foreign capitals today.

In fact, they are protected by a peculiar interpretation of international law that shields them from justice in U.S. courts for terrorist acts on U.S. soil.

This bill, a version of which passed the Senate unanimously, would correct misinterpretations of previous legislation and lower court decisions, and empower survivors and families of the victims of international terrorism to seek a measure of justice through our civil court system.

This bill is needed because both the Congress and the executive have affirmed that civil litigation against terror sponsors, including governments, can have an important deterrent effect.

This bill is also mindful of the concerns some have about its possible effect on sovereign immunity. For that reason, it is narrowly focused and applies only to attacks committed on U.S. soil that harm U.S. nationals.

The attacks of 9/11 were roundly condemned by people and governments around the world, so this bill is needed not just for the families of those who died in New York and at the Pentagon and in Pennsylvania, but it is needed by people around the world.

We know we lost, roughly, 3,000 people on 9/11, but thousands and thousands more have died since the attacks because of the diseases that they now have because of being exposed to the toxins down at Ground Zero. Now they are predicting that, roughly, 15 people a day are concerned because cancer is now in their bodies from the exposure. So our people are still suffering.

Fifteen years is a long time to wait. This bill is needed. Justice, we need justice. I think it is a strong deterrent. I am proud of the United States Congress and the legislative body of this country for standing up and passing this bill.

I strongly urge my colleagues to not forget and to support overwhelmingly this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Justice Against Foreign Terrorists Act sponsored by Mr. KING of New York. As we approach the 15th anniversary of the horrific terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, it is appropriate that we, in Congress, are finally authorizing that victims from that terrible day have the right to pursue full justice in our courts of law.

I am a lawyer and I have worked with constitutional and statutory issues. This legislation does not convict any one person or any one nation, but it gives the loved ones of those who died recourse for full justice and compensation.

New Jersey lost more than 700 residents in the attacks, 81 of them from communities I represent here in Congress. I know some of those names, and I know all of those communities. They deserve their day in court, and they deserve the assistance of the Federal Government in being as transparent as possible with the evidence and the intelligence. The truth is the truth, and it is time that we all know this.

This measure passed the United States Senate with unanimous support, yet there are some who believe that the White House may threaten to veto the legislation, citing how it may compromise our relationship with certain other nations. This is backward logic.

Those nations should recognize the fundamental justice and legal remedies against a terrorist network that killed more than 3,000 Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote. I am sure this will pass overwhelmingly, perhaps unanimously, in a bipartisan fashion.

□ 1130

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, look around the world. In Europe, in Asia, in the Middle East, and in Africa, wherever you see evidence of radical Islam, that extremism can usually be traced to preachers of hate from Saudi Arabia.

The Kingdom has blood on its hands. Is it the blood of the victims of 9/11? Possibly. Fifteen of the nineteen hijackers were Saudis. Some Saudis were permitted to flee this country without thorough interviews. "Saudi Arabia has long been considered the primary source of funding for al Qaeda." [The 9/11 Commission Report, p. 171]

Intelligence Committee Chair Senator Bob Graham saw "a direct line between at least some of the terrorists who carried out the September 11 attacks and the Government of Saudi Arabia." [Saudi Arabia May Be Tied to 9/11, 2 Ex-Senators Say; New York Times; Feb. 29,

2012] But evaluating all of this evidence, the evidence of both sides, is why we have a judicial system in the first place. And for our government to obstruct the 9/11 victims—their families—from seeking the truth about Saudi Arabia and its involvement is just flat wrong.

Some in our government have tried to hide as much as they could for as long as they could about the Saudis. Ignoring Saudi treachery, we had a President who literally held hands with the Crown Prince while attacking another country in the biggest foreign policy disaster in our Nation's history that continues to plague us.

The Muslims that I know, who are my neighbors in Texas, and those with whom I meet here in Washington, do not deserve blanket blame for themselves or for Islam, but neither should there be blanket immunity for those who may have committed wrong.

I salute the bipartisan sponsors of this legislation. Give these 9/11 families their day in court and accord the Saudis all of the rights in a judicial proceeding that they so regularly deny their own citizens.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. DONOVAN).

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, to begin, I would like to acknowledge and thank Speaker RYAN, Chairman GOODLATTE, and Chairman UPTON. I have been a Member of this distinguished institution for only 16 months, and, in that time, they have done right by the heroes I represent in Congress. I thank them, and the thousands of heroes and their families from my district thank them as well.

My good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), has been a fierce advocate for all 9/11 heroes and their families for the last 15 years, and it is an honor to stand by his side.

I would like to read into the RECORD part of a letter written to me last week by Lori Mascali, the widow of firefighter, and my good friend, Joseph Mascali from New York City Fire Department's Rescue 5:

"It's Sunday morning, and the smell of coffee fills the air as I wait to hear the sound of the key in the front door. I know that sound of that key will be followed by the words, 'I'm home,' and my heart is excited. No longer do I hear the sound of the key in the door on a Sunday morning. No longer do I hear the simple words, 'I'm home.' Sovereign immunity should not be allowed as a shield of protection for persons or nations that fund terrorists and cause mass murder. JASTA must be passed to send a strong message to all nations: if you fund terrorism, there will be accountability."

Mr. Speaker, this bill is about giving victims of terror attacks on United States soil their day in court and the chance to hold everybody accountable—including foreign governments that may have been involved.

9/11 devastated families in my district—and for me, their priorities are

my priorities. I support this bill, and ask my colleagues to join me in voting for passage.

As my good friend from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) said, the President has threatened to veto this bill, but, for those Americans who have earned the right for justice, I hope he has the conviction and courage to sign JASTA into law.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago, my Congressional District lost 200 men and women—families named Downey, families named Murphy, families named Uggiano, and so many other families. In the years since, those who responded to that act of terror have been getting sicker and sicker and sicker.

They all deserve justice, Mr. Speaker. You get justice on the battlefield. You can get justice in the courtroom. This bill ensures that they have the right to justice in the courtroom. For that simple and very profound reason, I support this bill. I was pleased to cosponsor the bill with my friend from New York (Mr. KING).

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President not to veto this bill. I thank my friend from Michigan.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE for his extraordinary work on this legislation, Mr. CONYERS, and, of course, PETER KING who has been absolutely tenacious picking up the good work that Dan Lungren, a former member of Congress and Attorney General of California, had done on this legislation previously.

This is a bipartisan piece of legislation, and it has to be signed by the President. I certainly hope—echoing comments of the previous speaker—that the President will, indeed, sign it into law.

This bill holds the promise of some measure of justice for the victims of al Qaeda's horrific terrorist attack on the United States 15 years ago this Sunday.

Time has not diminished the suffering of those who have lost loved ones on that day, nor has it brought accountability and, certainly, has not brought closure.

This bill aims to change that to some degree by overturning the legal challenges that have stood between the victims and the justice they rightly seek from foreign governments and individuals suspected of financing the 9/11 attacks.

I have worked extensively with the 9/11 survivors and the family members. I have worked with the Jersey Girls, as they became known, who pushed so

hard for the 9/11 Commission that was chaired by my former Governor Tom Kean, who did yeoman's work to get to the bottom of what happened and what we might do to mitigate such a crisis going forward. Unfortunately, there still are gaps, and this is one of those gaping holes that need to be closed.

Here today are some of those family members, many of them widows: Kathy Wisniewski, who works on my staff who lost her son, Alan; Mindy Kleinberg; Lorie Van Auken; Monica Gabrielle; and Carol Ashley are here in the Chamber and have pushed so hard for this legislation.

Not here but here in spirit: Kristen Breitweiser, Patty Casazza, and Sheila Martello.

Mary and Frank Fetchet also are with us. They lost their son Brad.

These are people who have said "never again" needs to mean never again so no other Americans would suffer what they have endured at the loss of their loved ones. This is why this legislation is another major step forward.

Look at the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act and the impediments that it has placed. As some of my colleagues have said earlier, we just want in court to be able to get at the truth: who was part of the facilitating and the financing of the 9/11 murderers—the terrorists—that killed some 3,000 people, 50 of whom—more than 50 who lived in my own congressional district.

This bill also would amend the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1987. The bill will open foreign officials to accountability to so-called secondary liability, such as aiding and abetting or conspiring with terrorist perpetrators. These are very commonsense and modest changes to the law that will hopefully get us closer to justice for those who have suffered so much. It is a great bill.

Again, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE. PETE KING has been absolutely tenacious, and our leadership has heeded those calls and is supportive. I want to thank them for ensuring it came up today prior to the 15th anniversary of that infamous event.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the bipartisanship of this bill and the emotional but clear discussion that has gone on in support of it. Because of the importance of enacting legislation of this importance and the recognition of the concerns raised, I know that we can continue to work with the administration to resolve these issues so that this measure can be signed into law by the President of the United States.

I thank everyone who has participated.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say, first of all, thank you very much to the ranking member of the committee, the gen-

tleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for working with us on this legislation. I want to congratulate the chief sponsors of the legislation, particularly Congressman KING of New York who has, as many have said here, been tenacious at pursuing justice.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in support of today's vote on S. 2040, the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act (JASTA).

Next week, our nation will mark the 15th anniversary of the September 11th attacks. The United States suffered an immeasurable tragedy that day, but for the victims and their families, their loss was even more profound. Their lives were irrevocably changed that day, and their road to healing has been made all the more difficult by the questions that remain unanswered and by the justice that has yet to be served.

S. 2040, along with its House companion bill H.R. 3815, of which I am a proud cosponsor, would go a long way in providing answers to the victims and their families. In pursuing civil claims against terrorists, as well as those who aided and abetted them, we will be able to ensure greater transparency. The process of trying civil suits in a court of law would bring to light new evidence about how those events came about including identifying the money flows to the hijackers, as well as any connections the perpetrators had to foreign government officials. Ultimately, it will help to provide a more complete story of the September 11th attacks, not only of what happened that day, but also of what happened in the days leading up to them.

I have worked over the last number of years with my colleagues Congressman WALTER JONES and Congressman THOMAS MASSIE in calling for the declassification of the 28 pages of the Joint Congressional Inquiry into Intelligence Activities before and after the Terrorist Attacks of September 2001. In doing so, I have also had the honor and privilege of getting to know some of the families who lost loved ones during the attacks. These families need and deserve answers and justice. Their representatives in Congress should be working tirelessly to give them that.

The release of the 28 pages earlier this summer was an important first step in getting answers for the families. Passing JASTA today, and getting it enacted, would be an equally important next step towards getting justice for the victims, survivors and their families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2040.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the

gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, and the order of the House of today, proceedings will resume on questions previously.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Adoption of the motion to recommit on H.R. 5424; and passage of H.R. 5424, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

INVESTMENT ADVISERS MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 5424) to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 and to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to amend its rules to modernize certain requirements relating to investment advisers, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 176, nays 232, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 494]

YEAS—176

Adams	Costa	Hahn
Aguilar	Courtney	Heck (WA)
Ashford	Crowley	Higgins
Bass	Cuellar	Himes
Beatty	Cummings	Hinojosa
Becerra	Davis (CA)	Honda
Bera	Davis, Danny	Hoyer
Beyer	DeFazio	Huffman
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Israel
Blumenauer	Delaney	Jackson Lee
Bonamici	DeLauro	Jeffries
Boyle, Brendan	DelBene	Johnson (GA)
F.	DeSaulnier	Johnson, E. B.
Brady (PA)	Deutch	Kaptur
Brownley (CA)	Dingell	Keating
Bustos	Doggett	Kelly (IL)
Butterfield	Duckworth	Kennedy
Capps	Edwards	Kildee
Capuano	Ellison	Kilmer
Cárdenas	Engel	Kind
Carney	Eshoo	Kirkpatrick
Carson (IN)	Esty	Kuster
Cartwright	Farr	Langevin
Castor (FL)	Foster	Larsen (WA)
Castro (TX)	Frankel (FL)	Larson (CT)
Chu, Judy	Fudge	Lawrence
Ciulline	Gabbard	Lee
Clark (MA)	Gallego	Levin
Clarke (NY)	Garamendi	Lewis
Clay	Graham	Lieu, Ted
Cleaver	Grayson	Lipinski
Clyburn	Green, Al	Loeb sack
Cohen	Green, Gene	Loftgren
Conyers	Grijalva	Lowenthal
Cooper	Gutiérrez	Lowey

Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Maloney, Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Payne

Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Sánchez, Linda T.
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman

Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

NAYS—232

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Babin
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishkek
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blum
 Bost
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Clawson (FL)
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Costello (PA)
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Curbelo (FL)
 Davidson
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 Diaz-Balart
 Dold
 Donovan
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers (NC)
 Emmer (MN)
 Farenthold
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Garrett

Gibbs
 Gibson
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guthrie
 Hanna
 Hardy
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Heck (NV)
 Hensarling
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice, Jody B.
 Hill
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd (TX)
 Hurt (VA)
 Issa
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (NY)
 Johnson (OH)
 Jolly
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Katko
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Knight
 Labrador
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Latta
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 MacArthur
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McSally

Meadows
 Meehan
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (MI)
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palmer
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Perry
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Poe (TX)
 Poliquin
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price, Tom
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Hurt (VA)
 Issa
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (NY)
 Johnson (OH)
 Jolly
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Katko
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Knight
 Labrador
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Latta
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 MacArthur
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McSally

Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)

Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall

Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin

NOT VOTING—23

Brown (FL)
 Connolly
 DesJarlais
 Doyle, Michael F.
 Fincher
 Gohmert
 Guinta

Hastings
 Johnson, Sam
 Lynch
 Miller (FL)
 Neugebauer
 Nugent
 Palazzo
 Reichert

Ross
 Rush
 Russell
 Ryan (OH)
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Swallow (CA)
 Westmoreland
 Zinke

□ 1203

Messrs. COFFMAN, BISHOP of Michigan, MCHENRY, SIMPSON, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. STIVERS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. PERLMUTTER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 261, nays 145, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 495]

YEAS—261

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Aguilera
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Ashford
 Babin
 Barletta
 Barr
 Davidson
 Beyer
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blum
 Bost
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carney
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Clawson (FL)
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Connolly

Cook
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello (PA)
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Curbelo (FL)
 Davidson
 Davis, Rodney
 Delaney
 DelBene
 Herrera Beutler
 Dent
 DeSantis
 Diaz-Balart
 Dold
 Donovan
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Ellmers (NC)
 Emmer (MN)
 Esty
 Farenthold
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Garrett
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Graham

Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Grothman
 Guthrie
 Hanna
 Hardy
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Heck (NV)
 Heck (WA)
 Hensarling
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice, Jody B.
 Hill
 Himes
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd (TX)
 Hurt (VA)
 Issa
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (OH)
 Jolly
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Katko
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kilmer
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline

Knight
 Labrador
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lance
 Larsen (WA)
 Latta
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 MacArthur
 Maloney, Sean
 Marino
 Massie
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McSally
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (MI)
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Moulton
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Neugebauer
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palmer
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Perlmutter

Perry
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Poe (TX)
 Poliquin
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price, Tom
 Quigley
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney (FL)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Royce
 Ruppersberger
 Russell
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schrader
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Sewell (AL)
 Shimkus
 Shuster

NAYS—145

Adams
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bera
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Conyers
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Duckworth
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Farr
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard

Gallego
 Garamendi
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Higgins
 Hinojosa
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kildeer
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loebach
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Maloney, Carolyn
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng

Moore
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Price (NC)
 Rangel
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Sánchez, Linda T.
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Scott (VA)
 Serrano
 Sherman
 Sires
 Levin
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—25

Barton	Griffith	Palazzo
Brown (FL)	Guinta	Reichert
Bucshon	Hastings	Ross
DesJarlais	Johnson, Sam	Rush
Doggett	Lamborn	Ryan (OH)
Doyle, Michael	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta
F.	Marchant	Swalwell (CA)
Fincher	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Gohmert	Nugent	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLY of Mississippi) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1209

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall vote 495. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye".

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 495, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 494, the vote on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 5424, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act of 2016, had I been able to vote, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 495, the vote on Final Passage of H.R. 5424, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act of 2016, had I been able to vote, I would have voted "nay."

□ 1215

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) for the purpose of giving us the schedule for the next week.

(Mr. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, no votes are expected in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today.

The House will also consider H.R. 3590, the Halt Tax Increases on the Middle Class and Seniors Act, sponsored by Representative MARTHA MCSALLY. This critical bill will prevent Americans with high healthcare costs from facing a tax increase next year.

Additionally, the House will consider H.R. 5620, the VA Accountability First

and Appeals Modernization Act, sponsored by Representative JEFF MILLER, which ensures that employees at the Department of Veterans Affairs are held accountable for misconduct or poor performance. This bill will also modernize the disability appeals process to reduce the unacceptable backlog of claims.

The House will also consider H.R. 5226, the Regulatory Integrity Act, sponsored by Representative TIM WALBERG, which is a commonsense bill requiring agencies to publish information about proposed regulations on their Web sites.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 5351, sponsored by Representative JACKIE WALORSKI, which prohibits the transfer of any individuals detained at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that schedule. I won't discuss any of the bills that the gentleman mentioned on the schedule, but I do want to note a couple of absences. One is, of course, the continuing resolution.

As the gentleman knows, after next week where the CR is not included, we have 9 legislative days left before the scheduled adjournment. As the gentleman knows, we have not passed a single appropriations bill. And without finding fault with either side—because I know each side thinks the other side is at fault—the fact remains we have not passed a single appropriations bill.

So there is no alternative to a continuing resolution, and we must pass a continuing resolution if the government is going to operate on October 1 in the new fiscal year. The limited number of days in session—9 days after next week.

There are reports that the House Republicans are already divided on how long the CR ought to be, whether or not we ought to go into the 115th Congress or not. Representative TOM COLE was quoted as saying, "Since we're all drawing our checks, we ought to actually do our job and get it done"—meaning the appropriations process and the funding of the government—"and recognize that the next administration and the next Congress are going to have plenty to do and to deal with on their own and not throw additional work at them because we are either too lazy or incompetent to do our work."

That is Representative TOM COLE, one of the senior Members of this body, a former chairman of the campaign committee, and a respected Member of this body.

Mr. Leader, I believe we ought to pass a CR as soon as possible, consider it as soon as possible. My own belief is that it ought to be short-term. I believe many people share that view. Apparently, Senator MCCONNELL shares that view as well.

It is my understanding the Senate is going to consider such a CR and send it to us. Obviously, it is our responsibility on fiscal matters under the Con-

stitution to move pieces of legislation. They may well amend theirs into a House bill, as I am sure you know that both sides do from time to time.

Can you tell me, A, how long do you expect the CR—first of all, when do you believe we will consider a continuing resolution to fund government past September 30? Secondly, how long do you think that CR will extend? Thirdly, as we did last year, is it your expectation that we will do an omnibus in December in the lameduck?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do want to just clarify one of your statements. Surely the gentleman did not mean from the point that no appropriations bills have passed this floor because six have passed. They just have not been sent to the President.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, as the gentleman and I both know, no appropriations bills have been enacted. As I pointed out, forgetting about who is to blame—and I am sure you and I have different perspectives on that—the fact of the matter is they haven't passed, and they haven't been signed by the President. When I say "passed," that's the Congress. They haven't passed the Congress, and the President hasn't signed any. So there is no possibility we are going to pass one or more of those bills.

As you know, there are 12 appropriations bills to fund government. We haven't passed one of them. It doesn't look like we are going to pass any of them, so we are going to need a CR. So my question relates to the CR. There are three points.

I thank the gentleman for clarifying it.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for clarifying.

Just one more little clarification, if the gentleman may. All 12 of the appropriations bills have passed out of committee. So it is our desire to finish that work.

Yes, it looks as though we will be into a continuing resolution. We have funding up until September 30. It is our intent to have that done before we depart. We will not depart without finishing that work.

The duration is up for discussion, and we have been having discussions on both sides of the aisle about that. But as soon as that decision is made, Members will be advised when the floor action is scheduled. But I assure the gentleman it will be done before any Member is departing.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I presume that. I presume that the majority—and I will say this, that for whatever reasons—and your party is in control of both the House and the Senate. Yes, we have the Presidency, the Democrats, but no bills have reached his desk. Whether they got out of committee or not, no bills have reached his desk.

You and I both know getting out of committee means nothing. Nothing happens because it gets out of committee, other than it is eligible to come to the floor. Beyond that, nothing happens with respect to funding government. And your party is in the majority. It is not a question of blame. It is a question of no bill has passed from the Congress to the President of the United States for signature. He hasn't vetoed any bills because they haven't gotten to him. So we need to adopt a CR.

I think the gentleman is correct that we are not going to go home, I presume, without passing a CR. The government was shut down for 16 days some years ago because we wouldn't repeal the Affordable Care Act. I don't presume that is going to happen this time.

I certainly hope that we address the CR. It is not scheduled for next week.

I am going to discuss another subject in just a second that should have been scheduled, in my view, this week. But we did bills that, frankly, aren't going to pass or be sent to the President. We spent a full week—otherwise known as 25 percent of the time—that is scheduled for us to be here before the election.

Next week, it will make it 50 percent of the time, and still no CR is being brought forward. We left town in July without passing the Senate bill—it passed 68-30, a bipartisan bill—to address the critical health crisis confronting the American people, Zika. You don't schedule that for next week either on your schedule, Mr. Leader.

I am very concerned. I think America is very concerned. Certainly, on this side of the aisle, we are very concerned.

I want to make a representation here publicly, so that America will know and you will know, that I am prepared to say that almost everybody in our caucus—I would say “unanimous,” but I haven't talked to everybody—is ready to pass the bipartisan Senate bill, which passed 68-30, which would appropriate \$1.1 billion.

Tony Fauci was on the Hill, who is the director of NIH's NIAID, National Institute of Allergies and Infectious Diseases, which of course Zika falls within the ambit of his expertise and authority.

□ 1230

He has said as of October 1, he is going to have no money to deal with the development of a vaccine. I know the gentleman is as concerned as I am because we have talked about setting up funds for disasters; and this is a health crisis, obviously a disaster.

Let me ask the gentleman if he expects Zika funding to come to the floor either with the CR or as a separate bill, and again, I represent to him, I believe every Democrat—I haven't talked to every Democrat, but I believe every Democrat will support the bipartisan Senate bill which passed 68-30, which appropriates money and has the virtue,

unlike the conference report, which the House added poison pill language that they knew neither the Democrats would support in the House nor the Senate nor would the President support, undermining, frankly, the ability to have health services delivered in Puerto Rico to women, the epicenter of the Zika crisis.

It should have been no surprise that that was not going to be supported, and the President made it very clear he was not going to support it. We need to reach a compromise. The Senate reached a compromise. I urge the majority leader to address this and bring it to the floor. I tell him, he will have my full support and engagement for the Senate bill, which was a bipartisan bill.

I yield to my friend to let us know when he expects to deal with this critical health crisis confronting the American people.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Before I begin, I want to thank the gentleman. At the very beginning of this crisis, you and I sat together. At the very beginning of this crisis, you and I compiled a group of Members on both sides of the aisle with the expertise to deal with it. \$600 million quickly went out the door to fight it, to combat it. The Senate approved \$1.1 billion.

I am somewhat excited to hear that all the Democrats will change their mind now and vote for the bill because I would like to remind the gentleman that in June this House took up this issue because we knew what would happen in the summer. We know what is transpiring in Florida because we predicted that it would because it was already happening in Puerto Rico, but that was not the case on this floor that night. Everyone on the other side said “no.”

Well, you know what, in the Senate, they have taken this up three times. Your side of the aisle decided to leave without dealing with this issue. They could have dealt with this issue this week. This is the exact amount of money that the Senate voted for unanimously over there—maybe not unanimously, but bipartisanship. This is not one to play politics with. We did our job here.

It is quite ironic that in clarification on your past remark saying Republicans are in the majority here, yes, that is true, and you saw that happen. The rules in the Senate are much different, where it empowers the minority to stop. That is why we are talking about a CR. But this should not be the case. You could have challenged your colleagues in that Senate, in your party, to stop the filibuster, that the people should not have to wait.

We have been in those rooms together. I know your desire. When you and I talked about putting the emergency funding together, you know what, that is an appropriations issue. We need this to get done. They need

the money. We need to combat it, and we need to continue to monitor it. That is why we dealt with this in June.

That is why I have the frustration that I have. Even when we came back this week, the Senate Democrats were in the exact same place they were before. This money goes to the community centers in Puerto Rico, exactly as the President requested.

So it is not a time to play politics. It is not a time to get frustrated about a different issue that you had that night so you couldn't vote “yes.” That is the truth behind this, and that is wrong.

Mr. HOYER. I could get very animated in my answer. The fact of the matter is, what the majority leader represents, in my view, is inaccurate. The Senate sent us a bipartisan bill, and because you think you needed to serve some of your most hard-line Members, you made it a political bill. And we were not going to take it. We are not going to see you eliminate Planned Parenthood, which overwhelmingly is the—listen to me, Mr. Majority Leader. I listened to you respectfully.

The bill eliminated Planned Parenthood services and funding to deliver services in Puerto Rico, the epicenter of this disease. And you put other legislation in that bill you knew was unacceptable to us. The Senate did not do that because they need 60 votes, which means they need to come to a bipartisan agreement. You rejected a bipartisan agreement on your side of the aisle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLY of Mississippi). The Chair would remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the majority party rejected the bipartisan legislation that came from the Senate with 68 votes. That is more than two-thirds of the Senate. Half of the Republicans in the United States Senate passed that bill over to us, and we could have passed it.

I know some people said we needed the \$1.1 billion, but I will tell you, had you brought that bill to the floor without adding political aspects to it that you knew we would not support, it would have passed. You could have passed it on your own, but you chose to make it a political bill. And we are not going to accept that because the American—you are right, Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve that we deal with this issue now.

The President asked for this money on February 22. We are now at September 10, Mr. Speaker, and we have not dealt with this except in a way that, frankly, the majority party knew would not be acceptable, would not be bipartisan, would not pass the Senate, and would not be signed by the President.

It is, I say with all due respect, Mr. Majority Leader, not credible to say because we didn't take what you wanted to jam down our throat when we had an agreement—not everybody agreed. I

understand some people on my side said, oh, no, 1.1 is not enough, and I frankly don't think it is enough. But it is a very substantial sum that would enable NIH to pursue vaccines and pursue other matters in Puerto Rico and Florida and other places in this Nation to keep our people safe.

So I tell the majority leader, again, bring the bipartisan bill passed to us by the United States Senate with 68 votes. Bring it to the floor as a House bill and we will pass it, and that is why I tell the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, that I believe every Member on my side of the aisle will vote for that, not because they believe \$1.1 billion will be sufficient to address this problem.

Leader PELOSI makes the very cogent point, Mr. Speaker, the Director of CDC says that it will cost \$10 million per child who suffers from microcephaly, which is the result of Zika. Very frankly, in Brazil they found that the results go beyond that. \$10 million. If 200 children get microcephaly, that gets to the dollars that the President wants from us to prevent this horrible consequence to the children and to the families of America.

So I say with all due respect, Mr. Majority Leader, you can say all you want—and I know the spin: the Democrats in the Senate are holding this up. I do not accept that. I think it is inaccurate. What is holding it up is putting in items in a bill that is absolutely essential, gratuitously, that you know we will object to as opposed to doing what the Senate did, Mr. Speaker, and that is reaching a bipartisan agreement. It is very tough to reach bipartisan agreements in this House because we have a group in this House who wants to wag the dog. And that is not what the American people expect.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have great respect for the majority leader, and he is accurate. We do sit down, we work together, and we can come to bipartisan agreements. We didn't sit down on this. The conference report was not signed by a single Democrat. There was no doubt that when it came to this House floor, there were no Democrats on that conference report, and we had no debate.

Now, one of the reasons we had no debate—I want to make it clear because the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, is going to make that clear as well—was our side, we thought there was another important issue, but the fact of the matter is not whether it was debated. There would have only been 30 minutes a side anyway, a short debate.

But the fact of the matter is the majority leader knows that the \$1.1 billion bill that the Senate passed, even though it is not the President's request, would have passed on this floor, and it would pass on this floor today. And NIH and CDC would have the resources, Mr. Speaker, that they need to protect the American people. Mr. Speaker, that is what we ought to do.

I now yield to my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman.

I think the best thing for the American people is to actually read the bill. So let me just read the section that you referred to, that you stated that no Democrat in Appropriations would sign on to, that no Democrats on the other side wanted to vote for. It referred to a block grant. Let me quote it. This is in the bill dealing with Zika. "For the funding for health services provided by public health departments, hospitals or reimbursed through public health plans."

Seriously, you are opposed to that? That is what you are fighting over while the mosquitoes begin to grow and go beyond State by State? This is what we are fighting over?

That \$1.1 billion, added with the other \$600 million, took place in June. Yeah, we couldn't get to the floor to debate it because you wouldn't give us one microphone. But I am sorry, I know there is a lot of politics that goes around here, but this is not. This is the moment, this is the time that we rise above it. The American people do not deserve that, and I say let's put this paragraph out, let the public read what the bill says, and I will promise you, the majority wants you to vote for it and stop playing games.

Mr. HOYER. I understand the majority wants to vote for what they want us to vote for. They don't want to reach a bipartisan—

Mr. MCCARTHY. You voted against that. Explain.

Mr. HOYER. I did vote against that. Mr. MCCARTHY. If the gentleman would please explain to me what—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HOYER. It is so hard, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I will be glad to yield to my friend. I have a comment, but I will yield to him first.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman across the aisle, it is true, we work closely together on the big issues, and we try to find common ground. In that spirit, will you tell me what in that paragraph you disagree with?

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman aware that the major deliverer of health services to women in Puerto Rico is through Planned Parenthood? Is the gentleman aware of that?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Did the President request, when he requested money, that it get delivered that way? Or in here may I remind the gentleman what I am requesting, "the funding goes for health services provided by public health departments, hospitals, or reimbursed through public health plans."

Public health means that is the way the health care is provided, so we are funding the entities that provide the

health care, exactly when the President had requested it.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, that language was clearly designed, as the gentleman knows, as the staff knows, and as has been publicized, to preclude one of the agencies that delivers health care in Puerto Rico from doing so, and that is Planned Parenthood that gets public funds. This is designed, we believe, to restrict it. But let's put that aside. Let's say we have a disagreement on that. Let's accept that.

□ 1245

What the Senate said, if we have disagreements on these things, we are going to pass a bill that gets that money out the door. And they passed it 68-30, which means approximately one-half of the Republicans voted for it because—and, very frankly—a predecessor of yours, Mr. BLUNT, was a co-sponsor of that bill—one of my very close friends, as you know—along with Mrs. MURRAY.

So, they achieved the objective in the United States Senate of doing exactly what I think you are actually correct, Mr. Speaker, in saying, and that is that the people want us to act.

It is not on the schedule this week. It is not on the schedule next week. And it ought to be on the schedule for consideration, and it ought to be in a bipartisan way, which means that both you and I could say that, yes, our sides can support this. Without, we have some very significant differences, Mr. Speaker. We all understand that. The American people understand that. And we ought not to try to deal with those in something as critically important.

That is what the Senate decided to do. That is what ROY BLUNT decided to do. That is what Senator MURRAY decided to do. And that is what 68 Members of the United States Senate decided to do.

Now, let's, just for the sake of argument, agree that we have a disagreement on the interpretation of what that does, but if we have a disagreement, that means that we are not able to pass that bill. You may disagree with our reasoning, but that is the fact. And that is the conclusion the United States Senate came to, Mr. Speaker. So they did a bill that they could agree on in a bipartisan way.

And I tell you, Mr. Speaker—I will reiterate it once again—bring the Senate bill. It wasn't our bill. This is a Blunt-Murray bill. Mr. BLUNT is the former majority leader and majority whip and minority whip of the House of Representatives. The Senator from Missouri, a Republican leader in the Senate, sent us a bipartisan bill.

Let's take that bill, and whatever other differences we have, let's debate them, Mr. Speaker. Those provisions can be brought to the floor separate and apart, without undermining the need to immediately fund the Zika public health efforts.

So, I, again, say to my friend, those two issues—and I might also add, perhaps in closing, that we ought to be

dealing with Flint as well, another public health issue that has been pending, Mr. Speaker, for over a year.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield, before he goes to a new subject?

Mr. HOYER. I would be glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. The only thing I want to clarify here is: Do you believe in debate and having the opportunity for people to air different sides?

Mr. HOYER. I do. That is why we didn't have a lot of debate because we were asking for Mr. KING's bills to be brought to the floor, as I recall. So I do believe in that.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOYER. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I would ask the gentleman to join with me, then, in requesting that the Democrats on the Senate—the filibuster denies the bill to even come up for debate, let alone it be voted for. So would you not join with me in asking the Democrats to stop playing politics with a filibuster and allow the bill to come up? If the bill fails, the bill fails. But it is not even being allowed to be debated.

You were always so good with reading articles, and I don't know that I have ever read one to you, but I would like to. If you will indulge me. PolitiFact—this is the organization that looks at what we say and tries to put truth to it. This is the headline: “Democrats Stretch Impact of Planned Parenthood Exclusions in Zika Bill.”

This is one highlighted:

“The bill also provided funds that would potentially help clinics and hospitals in nearly every municipality on the island.”

Could we not agree that that is more important than politics? Could we not agree that people are being affected every day and that those who are watching this debate shake their head and wonder why we are even having this fight?

In June, we passed a bill. Since that time, Democrats in the Senate will not even allow it to be debated, not even allow it to be debated, to vote it up or vote it down.

There is one thing Americans believe in: fairness. And I don't believe that that is fairness, if you deny a bill from coming forward. If you deny the bill from coming forward, you are blocking it.

So, if you want the true definition of what is happening in the Zika battle, it is that those on the other side of the aisle in the Senate are blocking the discussion from even taking place.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, they are not blocking anything. They passed a bill 68-30. They sent it here, and it was blocked from coming to the floor. And it would have passed.

If you believe, as you asked me, do I believe, should we consider things, the answer, of course, is yes.

And I said, as an aside, PETER KING, the former chairman of the Homeland

Security Committee has two bills that are supported by over 85 percent of the American public. Bring them to the floor on the premise, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to debate, consider, and vote. Bring them to the floor. Bring Mr. KING's bills to the floor. Bring the Senate bill. You know the Senate bill has 68 votes.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell the majority leader that, had he brought the Senate bill to the floor—we were precluded from voting on the Senate bill, Mr. Speaker. The majority leader just said, Oh, we ought to bring the bill to the floor. Isn't that the right thing to do? Well, if it is right for the Senate—and we can't control the Senate, but we can control the House. And, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, as you know, I was the majority leader, and I could decide whether to bring the bills on the floor or not bring them on the floor. The majority leader has that authority.

Bring the Senate bill to the floor. If, in fact, as the majority leader just said we ought to have debate, we ought to consider it, and we ought to vote, and if it goes down, fine; if it passes, that is the will of the House—will of the Senate, you said. If that is a good premise in the Senate, it is an even better premise in the House of Representatives.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask my friend, the majority leader, to bring that bill to the floor. Let's vote on it. That is what he said his premise was and what we were committed to. I agree with him.

I don't like the filibuster. I don't like the 60-vote rule in the Senate, I will tell you that. The 60-vote rule undermines democracy. If a bill has 50 percent and a committee reports it out, it ought to come to the floor. I agree with the majority leader on that. And Mr. REID and I have had some discussions on that. My colleague Senator CARDIN and I have had some discussions on that.

But if it is good for the Senate, it is good for the House. And the House does that. The majority can rule in this House. And if he brings that bill to the floor, it will pass. It will pass on Monday, I guarantee the gentleman.

And I know we need to conclude this. In all consideration, Ms. KELLY is coming over to explain to me schedules.

But this is serious, and I don't say this—the majority leader and I do work together. But let's pass this Zika bill, as the Senate passed it, and then have the arguments on stuff that we don't agree on. We do agree on the Senate bill, at least to the extent it goes, and there are things that we don't agree.

To make an aside, you stripped the Confederate Flag amendment from the conference report on the MILCON bill because you didn't want your guys to vote on it. Mr. Speaker, I understand that. That is why it was done. I didn't like that, but that passed the House, stripped out of the bill, not by the Senate, but by us. But that is an aside.

It is an aside because, you are right, Mr. Speaker, the majority leader is

right, that doesn't affect Zika. What affects Zika is that \$1.1 billion that we can get to them on Monday, Mr. Speaker. If the majority leader will bring it to the floor, we can pass it on suspension.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the majority leader's discussion on this matter, but we have some critical issues, Mr. Speaker, that we need to deal with: funding government, getting Zika passed, helping the people in Flint, funding opioids. We passed a bill. It was a good bill. The President signed it. We passed it in a bipartisan way, but we didn't fund it. Another health crisis.

We need to address these critical matters. These other bills may have merit, but they are not a crisis.

Mr. Speaker, unless the majority leader wants to say something further, I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3969. An act to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Laughlin, Nevada, as the “Master Chief Petty Officer Jesse Dean VA Clinic”.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2016, TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2016

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, September 12, 2016, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

9/11 ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, Sunday will mark 15 years since the September 11 attacks. Each year, this anniversary seems to sneak up on us faster than it did the year before.

September 11 forever changed who we are individually and as a country. It prompted grief, fear, and anger. The images of the Twin Towers collapsing one after the other are just as tragic today as they were a decade and a half ago. The scene of smoke rising from the Pentagon is seared in our memory. The gaping hole left in an open Pennsylvania field is something we will never forget.

September 11 also brought stories of courage, hope, and leadership. It tested the resolve of this great Nation. From the brave passengers of Flight 93, who

quite possibly saved this very building we are standing in today, to the first responders who gave their life to ensure the well-being and safety of others.

We will never forget the President, who confidently stood on the rubble of collapsed buildings in New York to comfort an uncertain nation. I will always remember the first pitch President Bush threw at Yankee Stadium several weeks later.

As tens of thousands of fans looked on, the ball went right down the middle. He threw a perfect strike. It was a symbolic moment. It was symbolic of America's ability to not only recover from tragedy but reemerge as a greater country than it was before.

In God we trust.

REMEMBERING 9/11

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today, on the steps of the House, we sang "God Bless America."

Standing on those steps some 15 years ago, the searing memory comes back again—the horrific bloodshed, the dividing of families, the loss of lives, the pain, and the tragedy. To those remaining loved ones, I offer my deepest sympathy. And to America: we will never forget.

I am grateful that we passed S. 2040 today, the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act. The reason is, our citizens should never be denied the right to enter courts and to petition for justice. As well, the pain needs to be eased.

I want to thank those first-responders. I visited Ground Zero. I have felt that pain. Every year, I think it is important for Americans to understand that we must remember to give honor and respect to those fallen and recognize the values of this Nation.

As this legislation makes its way, I am committed to working with the administration in ensuring that all is well. It is important to note today, as we sang "God Bless America," we honored those families still in pain by passing S. 2040, Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act.

God bless America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in recognizing and commemorating the 15th anniversary of the attacks on our homeland on September 11, 2001.

This Sunday will mark the 15th year since that day our nation faced the greatest loss of life on U.S. soil from an enemy attack since the attack on Pearl Harbor.

The years that have passed since that day have not dimmed my memory or diminished my resolve to see an end to terrorism not only in the United States, but around the world.

As a Member of Congress and a senior Member of the Committees on Homeland Security and the Judiciary, both of which deal with national security issues, I have long been committed and engaged in efforts to develop

policies that anticipate and respond to new and emerging challenges to the security of our nation and the peace and safety of the world.

I will never forget September 11, 2001 when 2,977 men, women and a children were murdered by 19 hijackers who took commercial aircraft and used them as missiles.

I stood on the East Front steps of the Capitol on September 11, 2001, along with 150 members of the House of Representatives and sang "God Bless America."

September 11, 2001 remains a tragedy that defines our nation's history, but the final chapter will be written by those who are charged with keeping our nation and its people safe while preserving the way of life that terrorists seek to change.

I visited the site of the World Trade Center Towers in the aftermath of the attacks and grieved over the deaths of so many of our men, women, and children.

I want to thank and commend the work of our first responder community on that day and every day since September 11 for their efforts to protect their communities and our nation from acts of terrorism.

I watched as thousands of first responders, construction workers, and volunteers worked to recover the remains of the dead, and removed the tons of debris, while placing their own lives and health at risk.

The men and women who worked at "Ground Zero" were called by a sense of duty to help in our nation's greatest time of need since the bombing of Pearl Harbor.

There is unfinished work for those first responders who were injured or suffered illnesses during and after the September 11, 2001 attacks.

September 11 will forever remain a part of our national memory and for those who serve in Congress a clarion call to be vigilant against those who would do our nation harm.

To respond to the medical needs of the thousands of people who became ill from exposure to the toxic environment at Ground Zero, Congress passed the James Zadroga September 11 Care Act (9/11 Care Act), which provides rescue and recover workers with health care to treat the conditions that resulted from their exposure to toxic dust after the terror attack.

Under the leadership of President Obama, Bin Laden was found and killed.

President Obama accepted, and succeeded in the mission to bring justice to those responsible for the carnage of September 11, 2001.

Today, let us remember those who perished on this awful day 14 years ago, and rededicate ourselves to honoring their sacrifice by doing all we can to protect our homeland and all who dwell peaceably therein.

BIRTHDAY CARDS FOR AVA

(Mr. YOUNG of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, everyone, meet Ava.

Ava hails from Bondurant, Iowa, and is turning 11 years old next week. She is the beautiful daughter of Kris and Joni Hutchinson. Something you should know about Ava? Ava is a warrior. She is a fighter. She also is battling brain cancer.

Now, cancer is not new to Ava. It is something she has fought as a toddler. The battle began again, though, for Ava this summer.

Ava has faced the heartbreaking realities and struggles in her fight against cancer that many folks are lucky enough to never encounter in their lifetime, but Ava is strong, Ava is brave, and Ava is an inspiration to us all. She makes us all smile—everyone she has met.

With her 11th birthday quickly approaching, you may be asking yourself: What does she wish for? Ava wants a birthday card from you—anyone—everyone who would like to send one.

Folks from across the country and around the world are sending birthday cards for Ava. Of the cards, she said: I like getting them because I know people are praying for me and thinking about me every day.

Let's help make Ava's birthday one to remember. I encourage all who can—everybody—to take part in this outpouring of love and support for Ava. Anyone can send a card to Ava at: cards for Ava, 104 9th Street SE, Altoona, Iowa 50009. The address is right here.

Mr. Speaker, today, let us take a moment to send our thoughts and prayers to Ava and her family. Let us wish Ava a happy birthday. The best one is yet to come.

Happy birthday, Ava.

□ 1300

CONGRESS NEEDS TO DO ITS JOB NOW AND FULLY FUND ZIKA

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to stop playing around with people's lives and fully fund the fight against Zika now.

For my home State, Florida, at stake is the future of our newborns, our tourism jobs, and the hopes and dreams of folks like Andrew and Christina Rosebrough. For the past 9 years, they have battled the ups and downs of infertility, seen numerous doctors, spending thousands of dollars on treatments and drugs. After years of heartache and disappointment, they actually gave up; and then their own miracle, Christina became pregnant.

They were elated. They were excited. But now their joy is tempered by anxiety and trepidation. Christina has to stay confined to her home, scared of that poisonous mosquito that would devastate her baby's brain.

Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to do its job now and fully fund Zika.

HONORING THE KENNEWICK AMERICAN YOUTH BASEBALL TEAM

(Mr. NEWHOUSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the remarkable achievements of the Kennewick American Youth baseball team, the reigning U.S. champions.

The Kennewick American team won the United States Division of the Cal Ripken World Series Tournament to become the U.S. champions. They then finished second in the world, competing against the best young baseball talent from around the world. Kennewick's own Simeon Howard was named the MVP of the U.S. side of the tournament, while setting a tournament record for hits.

With the support of their families and local community, Kennewick American concluded its season with an impressive 36 and 5 record, while becoming the first team from the Pacific Northwest to ever reach the championship game. This is an incredible achievement for the State of Washington as well as the Pacific Northwest.

I am proud to represent these young men in Congress. I congratulate the players and their coach, Bryan Knapik, on their tremendous success and look forward to following their run next season.

HEAR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, after Orlando, the largest mass shooting in our history, Democrats focused the Congress and the country on the urgent need to expand background checks. Many jurisdictions, including the Nation's Capital, have strong gun safety laws, but they are countermanded daily by congressional failure to pass national legislation to keep criminals from bringing guns from neighboring jurisdictions.

Eighty-one percent of the American people support background checks before purchase of a deadly weapon. They want Congress to check the recent spike in gun violence nationwide. They want us to pass H.R. 1217, our bipartisan background check bill. Hear the American people.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF LIEUTENANT ROBERT HESS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Lieutenant Robert Hess, a resident of Lock Haven, Pennsylvania, in the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District. Lieutenant Hess was recently chosen by the Military Chaplains Association to receive its Distinguished Service Award, which annually recognizes excellent chaplains in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Veterans Affairs, and Civil Air Patrol.

Lieutenant Hess was born in Lock Haven and joined the Navy after graduating from Lock Haven High School in 1990. As a member of the Navy, he has traveled extensively during his service, including time spent in Spain, France, England, Slovenia, Germany, Greece, and the Netherlands. He is currently attached to the Destroyer Squadron, DESRON 60.

Lieutenant Hess also spent several years as a civilian pastor before being recalled to Active Duty after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, which, of course, occurred 15 years ago this Sunday.

As an Army dad, I have the deepest respect for our servicemen and -women, including those such as Lieutenant Hess, who work every day to counsel, teach, and minister to the spiritual needs of those servicemembers.

TRIBUTE TO THE VICTIMS OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

(Mr. AL GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I love my country, and I rise today to pay tribute to those who lost their lives on 9/11. It has been a very painful thing for those of us who love our country.

But notwithstanding all of the pain that I and the many others endure, it is not the same pain as those who have loved ones who made a transition on that day. So today I rise in honor of those who made the transition, those who went forward when others were running away.

I salute those who are willing to stand and secure this country. I salute the police officers. I salute the military. I thank them for their service.

I also want to honor those who lost their lives, and I have great sympathy for those who survived and the family members.

I ask for a moment of silent prayer. Mr. Speaker, I know that there are still people who are willing to go into harm's way to make the ultimate sacrifice so that we can have a better quality of life in the freest country in the world.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SHASTA LIVESTOCK AUCTION

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the Shasta Livestock Auction, located in Cottonwood, California, which was opened in 1966 by Ellington Peek and his wife, Betty, and family.

Ellington is well known in California agriculture. He was named Tehama County's first Cattleman of the Year, California Livestock Man of the Year,

and an inductee into the Cowboy Hall of Fame.

In May, the Shasta Historical Society presented a program commemorating the auction yard, and while it tells a lot about the business, it also focuses on the person Ellington is that has made him so successful—an honest, hardworking man who represents the epitome of the American story.

Around the time Ellington Peek began buying and selling cattle at his yard, the industry started experiencing a lot of ups and downs in the market, forcing many ranchers out of the business. Refusing to give up, he took his business on the road, busing prospective buyers and sellers to different ranches and showing available cattle up on a slide show for purchase.

Later, this innovative model that was such a success ultimately led him to the business of video auction, starting the Western Video Market, with one of the first auctions selling over 25,000 head of cattle.

This innovation and vision not only gave California and Western cattlemen access to a national marketplace, but entirely changed the market. Today, it is a very viable and strong and thriving enterprise, the Shasta Livestock Auction, with the video market.

So I just want to say thank you to the Peeks; and also remembering their son they lost a few years ago, Andy, and what that means to that family operation and what it means, this anniversary of the 50th, to all of us in northern California.

CONGRATULATING UNITED LAUNCH ALLIANCE FOR ANOTHER SUCCESSFUL SPACE LAUNCH

(Mr. COFFMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the men and women of United Launch Alliance on another successful space launch on Thursday. United Launch Alliance, or ULA, is headquartered in Centennial, Colorado, and has provided assured access to space since 2006.

ULA's most recent launch propelled NASA's OSIRIS-REx into space. The payload will travel to a near-Earth asteroid called Bennu, map the chemical elements on the asteroid's surface, and then return a sample to Earth in 2023.

This launch marks ULA's 11th consecutive successful space launch. This amazing success record is a testament to the hard work of ULA's dedicated team of professionals.

Congratulations on a job well done.

NATIONAL SUICIDE PREVENTION WEEK

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because this week is National Suicide Prevention Week.

Studies have shown that roughly 90 percent of people who commit suicide struggled with mental illness. In July, with enormous bipartisan support, the House passed the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act to tackle our Nation's mental health crisis. In recognition of this week, I believe the Senate should immediately take up this very important piece of legislation.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, veterans who have served our Nation are even more at risk. The disturbing reality is that far too many of our veterans who fought for our freedom are not truly free when they return home.

We cannot be bystanders as our Nation's heroes struggle with mental illness and suicide. That is why we passed and signed into law the Clay Hunt SAV Act, which prioritizes mental health care for our veterans.

But there is still so much work to be done to reach out to those who may need our help. Together, we can and must erase the stigma surrounding suicide and mental health.

REPLACE LEAD PIPES

(Mr. TED LIEU of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, it has been 2 years since the people of Flint were able to turn on their faucets and get clean water, and Congress has not acted to help the people of Flint. That is a travesty and an injustice, and the issues since then have gotten even worse, not just for the people of Flint, but across America.

Multiple reports indicate that now at least 29 States have issues with lead in their drinking water. We need an investment for infrastructure that is not only going to help people no longer get poisoned, but also create new jobs.

That is why, on the House Budget Committee, I introduced an amendment to increase, by over \$3 billion, the funding to the State's Clean Water Revolving Fund to help local municipalities upgrade and replace lead pipes. There is now new technology such as plastic PVC pipes that do not leach lead that are safe. They are less expensive.

Cities and municipalities and States across the Nation should be investing in plastic pipes to deliver lead-free water to our residents. It is my hope that Congress acts on this soon.

CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN INDIANA'S COLLEGE OF NURSING AND HEALTH PROFESSIONS

(Mr. BUCSHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, the University of Southern Indiana's College of Nursing and Health Professions received the first-ever Nexus Award from the National Center for Interprofessional Practice and Education in August.

The Nexus Award is a prestigious national honor that recognizes the interprofessional, team-based approaches that connect higher education and health care with goals to transform healthcare delivery, improve health outcomes, and decrease costs.

I have personally toured USI's healthcare programs and met with the college's leadership as recently as last month, and I have long supported USI's work to fill healthcare delivery gaps, including serving urban and rural populations that would otherwise not receive primary healthcare services.

Congratulations to USI Dean Dr. Ann White, as well as the professors and students, for this outstanding national recognition.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HASTINGS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order and pursuant to House Resolution 842, the House adjourned until Monday, September 12, 2016, at noon, for morning-hour debate, out of respect to the victims of the terrorist attacks.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6733. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Sacramento County, CA, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2016-0002; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8451] received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6734. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Office of Head Start, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Departments Major final rule — Head Start Performance Standards (RIN: 0970-AC63) received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6735. A letter from the Secretary, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Rules, Regulations, Statements of General Policy or Interpretation and Exemptions Under the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act (RIN: 3084-AB33) received Sep-

tember 6, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6736. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — The Food and Drug Administration Food Safety Modernization Act; Extension and Clarification of Compliance Dates for Certain Provisions of Four Implementing Rules [Docket Nos.: FDA-2011-N-0920, FDA-2011-N-0921, FDA-2011-N-0922, FDA-2011-N-0143] (RIN: 0910-AG10, 0910-AG35, 0910-AG36, 0910-AG64) received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6737. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — New Animal Drugs for Use in Animal Feed; Category Definitions [Docket No.: FDA-2016-N-1896] received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6738. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of PB-22, 5F-PB-22, AB-FUBINACA and ADB-PINACA into Schedule I [Docket No.: DEA-433] received September 6, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6739. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Maryville, Missouri) [MB Docket No.: 16-68] [RM-11762] received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6740. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updated Statements of Legal Authority for the Export Administration Regulations to Include August 4, 2016 Continuation of Emergency Declared in Executive Order 13222 [Docket No.: 160808698-6698-01] (RIN: 0694-AH09) received September 6, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6741. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — International Traffic in Arms: Revisions to Definition of Export and Related Definitions (RIN: 1400-AD70) received September 6, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6742. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Program: Court Orders Prior to July 22, 1998 (RIN: 3206-AM67) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6743. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Prevailing Rate Systems; Abolishment of the Newburgh, NY, Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage

Area (RIN: 3206-AN26) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6744. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of the Asheville, NC, and Charlotte, NC, Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas (RIN: 3206-AN37) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6745. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Federal Employees Health Benefits Program and Federal Employees Dental and Vision Insurance Program; Excepted Service and Pathways Programs Miscellaneous Clarifications and Corrections (RIN: 3206-AM97) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6746. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Standards Branch, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oil and Gas and Sulfur Operations on the Outer Continental Shelf — Oil and Gas Production Safety Systems [Docket ID: BSEE-2012-0005; 16XEL1700DX EX1SF0000.DAQ000 EEEE500000] (RIN: 1014-AA10) received September 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6747. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Resources of the South Atlantic; Trip Limit Reduction [Docket No.: 130312235-3658-02] (RIN: 0648-XE824) received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6748. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 151130999-6225-01] (RIN: 0648-XE782) received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6749. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 150916863-6211-02] (RIN: 0648-XE833) received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6750. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 150818742-0610-02] (RIN: 0648-XE772) received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6751. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Small-Mesh Multispecies Fishery; Adjustment to the Northern Red Hake Inseason Possession Limit [Docket No.: 120109034-2171-01] (RIN: 0648-XE787) received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6752. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Closure of Purse Seine Fishery in the ELAPS in 2016 [Docket No.: 160322276-6276-01] (RIN: 0648-XE741) received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6753. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 150121066-5717-02] (RIN: 0648-XE725) received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6754. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; North Atlantic Swordfish Fishery [Docket No.: 120627194-3657-02] (RIN: 0648-XE567) received September 6, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6755. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Assistant Secretary for Financial Resources, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation (RIN: 0991-AC0) received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6756. A letter from the Acting Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Corrections Relating to Issuance of Notices to Appear, Warrants of Removal, Exercise of Power by Immigration Officers, and Standards for Enforcement Activities (CBP Dec. 16-14) received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6757. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-5464; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-097-AD; Amendment 39-18607; AD 2016-16-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6758. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-

2015-8468; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-208-AD; Amendment 39-18605; AD 2016-16-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6759. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-5462; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-131-AD; Amendment 39-18606; AD 2016-16-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6760. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Michigan Towns; Alma, MI; Bellaire, MI; Cadillac, MI; Drummond Island, MI; Gladwin, MI; Holland, MI; and Three Rivers, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2016-4629; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AGL-8] received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6761. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class C Airspace; Peoria, IL [Docket No.: FAA-2016-7416; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AWA-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6762. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class C Airspace; Boise, ID [Docket No.: FAA-2016-7467; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AWA-2] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6763. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class C Airspace; Syracuse Hancock International Airport, NY [Docket No.: FAA-2016-3937; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AWA-1] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6764. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the Minnesota Towns; Hutchinson, MN; Jackson, MN; Pipestone, MN; Two Harbors, MN; and Waseca, MN [Docket No.: FAA-2016-4271; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AGL-6] received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6765. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class E Airspace; Lake Providence, LA [Docket No.: FAA-2016-4236; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASW-5] received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6766. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class D Airspace; North, SC [Docket No.: FAA-2016-

1074; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASO-3] received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6767. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Park River, ND [Docket No.: FAA-2016-5856; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AGL-9] received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6768. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Harvey, ND [Docket No.: FAA-2016-5387; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AGL-13] received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6769. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Platte, SD [Docket No.: FAA-2016-5386; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AGL-12] received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6770. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Linton, ND [Docket No.: FAA-2016-5456; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AGL-11] received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6771. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Champlain Valley of New York Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2015-0010; T.D. TTB-142; Ref. Notice No.: 154] (RIN: 1513-AC19) received August 31, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5523. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from carrying out seizures relating to a structuring transaction unless the property to be seized derived from an illegal source or the funds were structured for the purpose of concealing the violation of another criminal law or regulation, to require notice and a post-seizure hearing for such seizures, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-730, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5111. A bill to prohibit the use of certain clauses in form contracts that restrict the ability of a consumer to communicate regarding the goods or services offered in interstate commerce that were the subject of the contract, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-731). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1301. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to extend to private land use restrictions its rule relating to reasonable accommodation of amateur service communications; with amendments (Rept. 114-732). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5104. A bill to prohibit, as an unfair and deceptive act or practice in commerce, the sale or use of certain software to circumvent control measures used by Internet ticket sellers to ensure equitable consumer access to tickets for any given event, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-733). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 670. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the Medicaid rules regarding supplemental needs trusts for Medicaid beneficiaries to trusts established by those beneficiaries, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-734). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3299. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to ensure preparedness for chemical, radiological, biological, and nuclear threats, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-735). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Financial Services discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5523 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 5977. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to provide to the appropriate committees of Congress advance notice of certain announcements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. ROUZER):

H.R. 5978. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to clarify the functions of the Chief Acquisition Officer of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 5979. A bill to ensure consideration of water intensity in the Department of Energy's energy research, development, and demonstration programs to help guarantee efficient, reliable, and sustainable delivery of energy and clean water resources; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. GALLEGO, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. TITUS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. JONES, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5980. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the treatment of veterans who participated in the cleanup of Eniwetok Atoll as radiation exposed veterans for purposes of the presumption of service-connection of certain disabilities by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 5981. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the provision of medical services to aliens present in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 5982. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for en bloc consideration in resolutions of disapproval for "midnight rules", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HENSARLING (for himself, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. LUTKEMEYER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. DUFFY):

H.R. 5983. A bill to create hope and opportunity for consumers, investors, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street accountable, eliminating red tape to increase access to capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, Transportation and Infrastructure, Rules, the Budget, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 5984. A bill to authorize the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians Water Rights Settlement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 5985. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida:

H.R. 5986. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to ensure small businesses affected by the onset of transmissible diseases are eligible for disaster relief; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5987. A bill to provide for recreational access for floating cabins on the Tennessee River System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. WOODALL, and Ms. ESTY):

H.R. 5988. A bill to provide penalties for countries that systematically and unreasonably refuse or delay repatriation of certain

nationals and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 5989. A bill to provide for continuing cooperation between the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Israel Space Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 5990. A bill to grant the Congressional Gold Medal to the troops who defended Bataan during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 5991. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 with respect to risk-based examinations of Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organizations; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 150. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that child safety is the first priority of custody and visitation adjudications, and that state courts should improve adjudications of custody where family violence is alleged; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN (for himself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. HARRIS):

H. Con. Res. 151. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that every effort should be made to assist in the reconstruction and development of communities against whom the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant has committed acts of genocide, war crimes, or crimes against humanity as determined by the United States Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. PITTS):

H. Con. Res. 152. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States and the international community should support the Republic of Iraq and its people to recognize a province in the Nineveh Plain region, consistent with lawful expressions of self-determination by its indigenous peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. JOYCE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. COOPER, and Ms. DELAURO):

H. Res. 854. A resolution supporting State, local, and community initiatives to encourage parents, teachers, camp counselors, and child-care professionals to take measures to prevent sunburns in the minors they care for, and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that State, local, and community entities should continue to support efforts to curb the incidences of skin cancer beginning with childhood skin-protection; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Edu-

cation and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. PERRY, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H. Res. 855. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives to re-member and honor the members of the United States Armed Forces, veterans, and military families who served in the aftermath of September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H. Res. 856. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of September 12, 2016, through September 18, 2016, as "Balance Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

295. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 36, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 5977.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 7 (related to establishment of Post Offices and Post Roads).

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 5978.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes) and Clause 14 (to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces).

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 5979.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 5980.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 5981.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

"The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 5982.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of legislative powers generally granted to Congress by that section, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 to 17, of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of specific legislative powers granted to Congress by those sections, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof;" and, Article I, Section 5, Clause 2, of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the powers of each House of Congress to determine the rules of its proceedings.

By Mr. HENSARLING:

H.R. 5983.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 ("To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes");

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 ("To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures");

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6 ("To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States"); and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 ("To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.").

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 5984.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 5985.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida:

H.R. 5986.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5987.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 5988.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 5989.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 5990.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 5991.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 213: Mr. PETERS and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 379: Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. LEE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 532: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 563: Mr. SIRE.
H.R. 800: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 814: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 842: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 846: Ms. GRAHAM and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 921: Mr. HIMES and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 1220: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1343: Mr. COHEN, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1399: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 1439: Mr. WALZ and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1441: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1460: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1538: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1559: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 1571: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1594: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 1708: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1969: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2050: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 2142: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 2293: Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 2368: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. ROS-

LEHTINEN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOEBACK, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BECERRA, and Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 2715: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 2716: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 2799: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 2846: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 2902: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 3061: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 3068: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 3099: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 3185: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 3235: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 3268: Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 3323: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 3378: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 3455: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. DELAURO,

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 3520: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3522: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 3599: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 3666: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3721: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 3742: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 3815: Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 3913: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 3952: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN,

H.R. 3991: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 4113: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 4479: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 4514: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 4526: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 4537: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 4615: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 4621: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 4773: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 4919: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LANCE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. JEN-

KINS of Kansas, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 4938: Mr. FARR, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 5002: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 5109: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 5122: Mr. LANCE and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 5166: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 5180: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 5204: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 5215: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 5256: Mr. SWALWELL of California,

Miss RICE of New York, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 5258: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 5271: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 5275: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 5292: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 5321: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 5337: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. JONES,

and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 5348: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 5351: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. PALMER, Mr. HARDY, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BUCK,

Mr. HILL, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 5361: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 5365: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 5418: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 5428: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 5440: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 5493: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 5499: Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 5501: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. HASTINGS,

and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 5518: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 5519: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 5568: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 5620: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 5632: Ms. PUNGREE.

H.R. 5650: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 5708: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 5721: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 5732: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia,

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 5756: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 5785: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 5836: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 5859: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 5867: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 5879: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 5904: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 5931: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 5941: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H.R. 5942: Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 5946: Mr. TURNER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 5948: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BERA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ROHR-

ABACHER, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. BASS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. HONDA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. COOK, Mr. FARR, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 5951: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 5958: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 5961: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. VARGAS.

H. J. Res. 94: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. STIVERS.

H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Con. Res. 114: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H. Con. Res. 140: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. STIVERS.

H. Con. Res. 141: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 149: Mr. KATKO, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H. Res. 28: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H. Res. 220: Mr. MULVANEY.

H. Res. 590: Mr. TONKO.

H. Res. 617: Mr. BURGESS.

H. Res. 729: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H. Res. 762: Mr. PALLONE.

H. Res. 829: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. WALZ.

H. Res. 840: Mr. VEASEY.

H. Res. 848: Mr. POCAN.

H. Res. 850: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. BENISHEK.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF FLORIDA

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in H.R. 5620 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Member added his name to the following discharge petition:

Petition 5 by Mrs. LOWEY on H.R. 5044: Mr. Murphy of Florida.